This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

TX 940.2 .M996 PT.1
Myers, P. V. N.
Medival and modern history /
Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 04934 4737

THE MIDDLE AGES

MYERS



SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
LIBRARY

TEXTBOOK COLLECTION
GIFT OF
THE PUBLISHERS

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES

PRESENTED TO Stanford Univ. LIBRARY
SAMPLE COPY
by GINN & CO., 325 Sansome St.,
S. F., CAL.

MEDIÆVAL AND MODERN HISTORY

PART I

THE MIDDLE AGES

BY

PHILIP VAN NESS MYERS

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF HISTORY AND POLITICAL ECONOMY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI; AUTHOR OF "A HISTORY OF GREECE," "ROME: ITS RISE AND FALL," AND A "GENERAL HISTORY"

BOSTON, U.S.A., AND LONDON

GINN & COMPANY, PUBLISHERS

The Athenæum Press

1902

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL

COPYRIGHT, 1885, 1902, BY
PHILIP VAN NESS MYERS

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

C

TO

Thaddeus H. Reamy

AS A TOKEN OF

LOVING ADMIRATION

71042

PREFACE

THIS book is a revision of the first half of my *Mediæval and Modern History*, the earliest impression of which was published sixteen years ago. It will be followed shortly by a companion volume entitled *The Modern Age*, which will contain the revised and extended text of the second half of the original work.

In the present volume the general perspective of the earlier work has not been essentially modified; but the emphasis has in places been slightly shifted, and the narrative carefully revised, so that it should embody the latest positive results of those scholarly researches which during recent years have been so active and so fruitful in the field of mediæval history.

The principles governing the selection and presentation of historical facts have been the principles adopted in the writing of the *Mediæval and Modern History*. Purely political, dynastic, and military matters have been kept in subordination to religious, moral, intellectual, and social interests. Unity has been impressed upon the narrative by keeping prominent the great ideals of the mediæval time, especially the ideals of the Papacy and the Empire, and by laying upon the Renaissance, which is viewed as essentially an intellectual movement and as the unconscious goal of mediæval endeavor and life, an emphasis corresponding to that laid upon the Reformation and the Political Revolution in modern history.

The series of maps in the earlier book has been augmented by the addition of various new charts, for the use of several of which I am indebted to the kind courtesy of Mr. D. H. Montgomery, author of *The Leading Facts of English History*. To each chapter has been appended a brief bibliography of the most important of the original sources and secondary works available in English.

As a closing word, I make grateful acknowledgment of the assistance I have received from George Lincoln Burr, professor of ancient and mediæval history in Cornell University. With the rarest generosity, Professor Burr has placed at my service his intimate and special knowledge of the period with which I have dealt, and with untiring patience has read all my proof-sheets. There is in the book scarcely a chapter which has not been improved and enriched by his suggestions.

P. V. N. M.

College Hill, Ohio,
May, 1902.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE v

LISTS OF MAPS ix

GENERAL INTRODUCTION: THE CHIEF FACTORS IN EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION 1

FIRST PERIOD. — THE DARK AGES

(From the fall of Rome, A.D. 476, to the eleventh century)

CHAPTER

I. Migrations and Settlements of the Teutonic Tribes . . . 15

II. The Conversion of the Barbarians 32

III. Monasticism 50

IV. Fusion of the Latin and Teutonic Peoples 60

V. The Roman Empire in the East 73

VI. Mohammed and the Saracens 87

VII. Charles the Great and the Restoration of the Empire in the West 117

VIII. The Northmen: the Coming of the Vikings 133

I. Introductory 133

II. The Danes in England 139

III. Settlement of the Northmen in Gaul 147

IX. Rise of the Papal Power 150

SECOND PERIOD. — THE AGE OF REVIVAL

(From the opening of the eleventh century to the discovery of America by Columbus in 1492)

X. Feudalism and Chivalry 162

I. Feudalism 162

II. Chivalry 181

XI. The Normans 189

I. The Normans at Home and in Italy 189

II. The Norman Conquest of England 191

CHAPTER		PAGE
XII.	The Papacy and the Empire	202
XIII.	The Crusades (1096–1273)	214
	I. Preparation of Europe for the Crusades	214
	II. The First Crusade (1096–1099)	227
	III. The Second Crusade (1147–1149)	234
	IV. The Third Crusade (1189–1192)	236
	V. The Fourth Crusade (1202–1204)	239
	VI. The Children's Crusade; Minor Crusades	241
	VII. Crusades in Europe	245
	VIII. The End of the Crusades; their Influence on European Civilization	248
XIV.	Supremacy of the Papacy; Decline of its Temporal Power	257
XV.	The Mongols and the Ottoman Turks	270
	I. The Mongols	270
	II. The Ottoman Turks	277
XVI.	The Growth of the Towns	284
XVII.	The Universities and the Schoolmen	307
XVIII.	The Renaissance	324
	I. The Renaissance before the Renaissance	324
	II. The Renaissance in Italy	333
	III. General Effects of the Renaissance	353
XIX.	Growth of the Nations: Formation of National Governments and Literatures	362
	I. England	363
	II. France	391
	III. Spain	405
	IV. Germany	411
	V. Russia	424
	VI. Italy	426
	VII. The Northern Countries	432
INDEX		437

LISTS OF MAPS

COLORED MAPS

NO.		PAGE
1.	Europe in the Reign of Theodoric, about A.D. 500	18
2.	Greatest Extent of the Saracen Dominions, about A.D. 750	104
3.	Europe in the Time of Charles the Great, A.D. 814	120
4.	The Western Empire as divided at Verdun, A.D. 843	130
5.	England after Treaty of Wedmore, A.D. 878	140
6.	England and Wales, 1066–1485	192
7.	Central Europe, 1180	204
8.	The Crusades and the Byzantine Empire, about 1150	228
9.	The Dominions of the Angevins	366
10.	The Spanish Kingdoms, 1210	404
11.	The Spanish Kingdoms, 1360	406
12.	Central Europe, 1360	418

SKETCH MAPS

1.	The Empire of the Ottoman Turks, about 1464	280
2.	The Hansa Towns and their Chief Foreign Settlements	290
3.	Russia and the Scandinavian Countries at the Close of the Middle Ages	425

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

THE CHIEF FACTORS IN EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION

1. **Divisions of the Subject.** — In a previous volume we sketched briefly the affairs of men from the time that they first emerged from the obscurity of the past to the downfall of the Roman empire in the West, A.D. 476. In the present work we propose to continue the narrative there begun, and bring the story down to our own day. It will be our aim constantly to direct special attention to the state and progress of society, the growth and decay of institutions, and the condition of religion and learning, so that our sketch may not be a recital simply of the outer circumstances, but a history of the real inner life of the European peoples — for with them we shall be almost exclusively concerned — during the period under review.

The fourteen centuries of history embraced in our survey are usually divided into two periods, — the *Middle Ages*, or the period lying between the fall of Rome and the discovery of America by Columbus in 1492, and the *Modern Age*, which extends from the latter event to the present time.

The Middle Ages can again be subdivided into two periods, — the *Dark Ages* and the *Age of Revival;* while the Modern Age can likewise be subdivided into two divisions, — the *Era of the Protestant Reformation* and the *Era of the Political Revolution.* We will indicate the limits and chief

characteristics of each of these four epochs or periods, in order that we may fix in mind the prominent landmarks of the vast region we are to traverse.

2. Chief Characteristics of the Four Periods or Epochs. — The *Dark Ages*, which embrace the years intervening between the fall of Rome and the opening of the eleventh century, are so called for the reason that the inrush of the barbarians, and the almost total eclipse of the light of classical culture caused them to contrast unfavorably, in enlightenment and social order, as well with the age which preceded as with that which followed them. The period was one of origins, — of the beginnings of peoples, and languages, and institutions. During this anarchical time, the *Holy Roman Empire* and the *Papacy*, institutions embodying two of the great ideals of the mediæval ages, grew into shape and form.

The *Age of Revival* begins with the opening of the eleventh century and ends with the discovery of the New World. During all this time civilization was making slow but sure advances; social order was gradually triumphing over anarchy, and governments were becoming more regular. The last century of the period especially was marked by a great revival of classical art and learning, — a movement known as the *Renaissance*, or the "New Birth," — by improvements, inventions, and discoveries which greatly stirred men's minds and awakened them as from a sleep. The Crusades, or Holy Wars, carried on by the Christians of Europe for the recovery from the Moslems of the sacred places in Palestine, were the most remarkable undertakings of the age.

The *Era of the Reformation* embraces the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth. The period is characterized by the great religious movement known as the Reformation, and the tremendous struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism. Almost all the wars of the period were religious wars. The last great combat was the Thirty Years' War in Germany, which was closed by the celebrated Peace of

Westphalia, in 1648. After this date the disputes and wars between parties and nations were dynastic or political rather than religious in character.

The *Era of the Political Revolution* extends from the Peace of Westphalia to the present time. Though an age crowded with an infinite variety of events, and marked by the contention of many and diverse principles, it is nevertheless especially characterized by the great conflict between despotic and liberal principles of government, resulting in the triumph of democratic ideas. During this period, in all the countries of Europe save Turkey and Russia, government by the people has taken the place of government by one or the few. This is one of the most important revolutions, in its potential consequences, that history records. The central event of the epoch was the terrible upheaval of the French Revolution.

Having now made a general survey of the region we are to traverse, having marked the three successive stages of the progressive course of civilization, the intellectual, the religious, and the political revolution, — which we shall hereafter refer to simply as the *Renaissance*, the *Reformation*, and the *Revolution*, — we must turn back to our starting-point, the fall of Rome.

3. Relation to World History of the Fall of Rome. — The calamity which in the fifth century befell the Roman empire in the West is sometimes spoken of as an event marking the extinction of ancient civilization. The treasures of the Old World are represented as having been destroyed, and mankind as obliged to take a fresh start, — to lay the foundations of civilization anew. It was not so. All or almost all that was really valuable in the accumulations of antiquity escaped harm, and became sooner or later the possession of the succeeding ages. The catastrophe simply prepared the way for the shifting in the West of the scene of civilization from the south to the north of Europe, simply transferred at once *political power*, and gradually social and intellectual

preëminence, from one race to another, — from the Roman to the Teuton.

The event was not an unrelieved calamity, because fortunately the floods that seemed to be sweeping so much away were not the mountain torrent, which covers fruitful fields with worthless drift, but the overflowing Nile with its rich deposits. Over all the regions covered by the barbarian inundation a new stratum of population was thrown down, a new soil formed that was capable of nourishing a better civilization than any the world had yet seen.

Or, to use the figure of Draper, we may liken the precipitation of the northern barbarians upon the expiring Roman empire to the heaping of fresh fuel upon a dying fire; for a time it burns lower, and seems almost extinguished, but soon it bursts through the added fuel and flames up with redoubled energy and ardor.

4. Relation of the Mediæval to the Modern Age. — We are now in a position to understand the real relation of the Mediæval to the Modern Age. The former was to civilization a period of recovery from interruption and disaster, — interruption and disaster that were really disguised blessings. It was a sort of spring-time, a germinal season, a period during which the germs of Greek and Roman civilization, scattered everywhere by the wide extension of Roman power during the preceding era, and the good seed of Christianity were taking root in the favoring soil of the hearts and minds of a new race.

During these centuries the arts, the sciences, the literatures, and the institutions that characterize the modern era took shape, and gave promise of what they were to become; the leading modern nations grew into form, and the future political divisions of Europe were more or less definitely outlined. In a word, the era bears the same relation to the Modern Age that the period of youth bears to that of manhood. This conception of its real character as a germinal, formative

period will tend to impress us with a proper sense of the importance of a careful study of its events and circumstances. It affords the key to modern history.

5. Elements of Civilization transmitted by Rome. — We must now notice what survived the catastrophe of the fifth century, what it was that Rome transmitted to the new race, the Teutonic, that was henceforth to be the guardian of the treasures of civilization. It was a rich bequest she made, a large part of which, however, had become hers through inheritance or through appropriation by conquest.

It will be convenient to consider what the northern or Teutonic nations received through Rome from the ancient world, under the following heads: 1. Græco-Roman civilization; 2. Christianity. We will speak of them separately.

6. Græco-Roman Civilization. — By the phrase "Græco-Roman civilization" we mean that whole body of arts, sciences, philosophies, literatures, laws, manners, customs, ideas, social arrangements, and models of imperial and municipal government, — everything, in a word, save Christianity, — that Greece and Rome, largely through the mediation of the Roman or Greek empire of Constantinople, gave to mediæval and modern Europe. These things constitute what is called in history the *classical element.* Taken together, they were a valuable gift to the new northern race that was henceforth to represent civilization.

From among the varied elements of this rich legacy of the elder to the younger world, we select for special mention here only three things, — the *idea of the Empire*, the *Roman law*, and *Græco-Roman art and literature.*

The first of these may seem a very vague, shadowy thing; but we shall see that this recollection of the great Roman state and its imperial glories had a profound influence upon mediæval and even later history. Men were constantly striving to reëstablish that old universal empire whose memorials and traditions had cast such a spell upon them. Just as they

strove to realize in their individual lives the ideal that Christianity held up, so did they in governmental matters strive to shape the world after the Roman model. The vast empire built up by Charles the Great and the "Holy Roman Empire" of the later German princes were simply revivals of the old Roman empire, the idea of which had fortunately been preserved by the new Rome on the Bosporus.

The Roman law system, with its admirable principles and practical ideas, exercised from the very first a great influence upon the rude legal forms, customs, and practices of the barbarians. Just as they adopted the moral law of Judæa, so did they adopt the civil law of Rome. Throughout a large part of Europe the Roman law, as embodied in the Justinian code (par. 65), came to form the groundwork of all legislation and jurisprudence, and everywhere its influence was felt upon statesman and jurist. Especially during the mediæval ages, when all Europe was much of the time in great confusion, was this ready-made law system a great help to rulers and judges who were trying to reorganize society and to administer justice between man and man. "No European lawyer," says Palgrave, "has failed to profit by Rome's written wisdom."

The stores of classical art and literature — such part of these as survived the disruption of the Roman empire — were destined to become a most important factor in the new civilization. It is true that the barbarian invaders of the empire seemed at first utterly indifferent to these things; that the masterpieces of the Greek artists were buried beneath the rubbish of sacked villas and cities, and that the precious manuscripts of the ancient sages and poets, because they were pagan productions and hence regarded as dangerous to Christian faith, were often suffered to lie neglected in the libraries of cathedrals and monasteries. Nevertheless, Greece and Rome, as we shall learn later, were the instructors of the Middle Ages. The mediæval architects were the pupils of the old master builders of Rome, and the mediæval philosophers learned

much of their wisdom from the great thinkers of ancient Greece. Especially was it the literary treasures of Greek antiquity, for which, towards the close of the mediæval period, the scholars of the West conceived a great admiration, that helped vastly to create the intellectual movement of the Renaissance, the herald of the Modern Age. It will appear hereafter, as we proceed with our narrative, how large a debt modern civilization owes to the preceding culture of ancient Greece and Rome.

7. Christianity. — Rome gave Christianity to the northern nations. In giving them this religion she gave them something which was destined to produce a profound influence upon all their future. It shaped all the events of their history. It moulded all their ideas and institutions. It informed all their literatures and ennobled their architecture, their painting, and their sculpture. It covered Europe with monasteries, cathedrals, and schools. It helped to abolish slavery and serfdom; it inspired the Crusades and aided powerfully in the creation of Chivalry. It added to mediæval history the chapter on the Papacy, and to modern that on the Reformation. It occasioned many wars, and yet blessed Europe with the Peace and the Truce of God (par. 189).

In a word, Christianity has so colored the whole life, and so informed all the institutions of the European peoples, that their history is very largely a story of the fortunes and influences of this religion which, first going forth from Semitic Judæa, was given to the younger Romano-German world by the missionaries of Rome.

Among the various doctrines taught by the new religion were these: the unity of God, the brotherhood of man, and the immortality of the soul. Besides these doctrines, Christianity brought in a new moral ideal, that is to say, a group of new virtues. These teachings and this new ideal of duty have done more than any other force to make the modern so different from the ancient world.

8. The Teutons. — In the foregoing paragraphs we have named some of the chief elements of civilization which the ancient world through Rome gave to the mediæval and modern. We must now see what the Teutons, who became the possessors of all these accumulations of the past, contributed to this world-treasure, to this ever-growing thing that we call civilization.

The Teutons were poor in those things in which the Romans were rich. They had neither arts, nor sciences, nor philosophies, nor literatures; but they had something better than all these: they possessed the essential elements of a virtuous and robust manhood.[1] And it was because of this, because of their *personal worth*, that the future time became theirs.

If we should analyze this character of the Teutonic peoples which we praise so highly, we should find in it at least four prominent traits of which we ought at this time to take special notice; namely, capacity for civilization, love of personal freedom, personal loyalty and devotion, and reverence for womanhood. We shall say just a word respecting each of these.

9. Their Capacity for Civilization. — We cannot better illustrate the capacity for civilization of the Teutonic nations than by contrasting them with some Turanian people, as, for instance, the Ottoman Turks. These Asiatic conquerors have been in contact with European civilization for centuries, but have shown themselves utterly incapable of profiting by such association, being wholly insensible to the influence of the superior culture of the European nations.

The Teutons fortunately belonged to a progressive family of peoples. They came of good stock. They had back of them the push of a strong and noble ancestry. In the process of time their open and susceptible nature appropriated whatever was good — and unfortunately much that was not good — in the civilization they had overthrown. It was this quality of

[1] Yet they were not without vices, chief among which were drinking and gambling.

the Teutonic conquerors, this boundless capacity for growth, for culture, for civilization, which saved the countries of the West from the sterility and barbarism reserved for those of the East that were destined to be overrun and taken possession of by the Turkish hordes.

10. Their Love of Personal Freedom. — The love of the Teutons for personal freedom is noticed by the old Latin writers. They could not even bear to have the houses of their villages set close together. "They dwell scattered and separate," says Tacitus, "as a spring, a meadow, or a grove may chance to invite them." The walled cities of the Romans they regarded as prisons. There were no towns in Germany before the eighth century, save a few places founded by the Romans along the Rhine and the Danube.

This same feeling of personal independence appears again in the relation sustained by the German warriors to their chief. They followed their chosen leader as companions and equals. The chief's power was extremely limited. "The general," says the Latin writer just quoted, "commands less through the force of authority than of example." And again we see the same independent spirit expressed in their assemblies of freemen (folk-moots), in which meetings all matters of public interest were debated, disapproval being manifested by a general murmur, and approval by the clashing of javelins and spears.

This sentiment of the Teutons determined in a large measure the nature of the institutions which they established upon the soil of the conquered empire. It was this element in their character which led them, influenced, however, by Roman customs and forms, to set up in all the countries of which they took possession that peculiar form of government known as Feudalism, — an organization allowing a great amount of personal independence among its members. In this same trait of the Teutonic disposition lay also the germ of representative government; for from the general assemblies of the

free Teutonic warriors beneath the forests of Germany may probably be traced the origin of the parliaments of modern Europe. Furthermore, in this characteristic of the Teutonic spirit, in this sentiment of individualism, according to some historians, lay hidden the germ of Protestantism, one main doctrine of which is the right of individual judgment in matters of religion and morals.

11. **Their Veneration for Womanhood.** — A feeling of respect for woman characterized all the northern or Teutonic peoples. Tacitus says of the Germans that they deemed something sacred to reside in woman's nature. This sentiment guarded the purity and sanctity of the home. In their high estimation of the sacredness of the family relation, the barbarians stood in marked contrast with the Romans. All students, ancient as well as modern, of the declining Roman empire admit that Rome fell mainly because of her vices, and that most prominent among these were those which, degrading woman, destroy the sanctity of the family life.

Now in bringing among the peoples of the corrupt and decaying empire the sentiment of which we speak, the barbarians contributed a most important element to European civilization. Strengthened by Christianity, it aided powerfully in giving birth to Chivalry, an institution which, as we shall see, colored all the events of the later mediæval centuries and gave to modern civilization some of its loftiest ideals (par. 163).

12. **Their Virtue of Personal Loyalty and Devotion.** — Another of the prominent traits of the Germans was that of personal attachment and fidelity. This is finely illustrated by the legend of one of the greatest of the Ostrogothic leaders, Theodoric (par. 16), or Dietrich von Bern, as the poets of a later time named him. Seven of the men of this chieftain had been taken captive by his enemy Ermenrich. "Night and day Dietrich bewails their loss and longs to die. In vain he offers for them Ermenrich's son and eighteen hundred men

whom he is keeping as hostages. Ermenrich threatens to kill Dietrich's men unless he cede his whole realm to him. And Dietrich answers: 'Even though all the empires of the world were mine, I would rather give them away than desert my dear faithful thanes.' He keeps his word, abandons his kingdom, and goes with his faithful ones into exile." [2]

This barbarian virtue of personal loyalty came later, as we shall learn (par. 145), to form one of the elements of strength in the feudal system, a form of social organization in which, in its best estate, the bond uniting its members was this personal one of mutual attachment and faithfulness

13. The Relative Importance in European History of the Classical, the Christian, and the Teutonic Element. — The question as to the influence which each of these great historical factors has exerted upon the development of European civilization is a very important one for the historical student, for the reason that his whole conception of history will be colored by the answer he gives to it. Gibbon, for instance, exalted the classical element and depreciated Christianity, representing this religion rather as a retarding than a helpful force in the life of the European peoples. This misconception of the real place in history that Christianity actually holds is a chief fault of Gibbon's great work, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.*

On the other hand, some ecclesiastical historians so represent history as to give Christianity credit for almost all the progress made by the European peoples since the advent of Christ. This is to depreciate unduly the other historical factors.

Still others again represent the Teutonic race element as the chief force in modern civilization, and rest their hopes for the future of the world largely upon the German and Anglo-Saxon spirit of enterprise, freedom, and progress.

It is certain that we should allow the exclusive claims of

[2] Francke, *Social Forces in German Literature*, p. 29.

none of these schools of interpreters of history. Modern civilization, as we have already intimated, is a very composite product. It has resulted from the mixing and mutual action and reaction upon one another of all the historical elements and agencies that we have mentioned — and many minor ones besides. Civilization cannot spare the treasures of Greek and Roman antiquity; it cannot spare the religious doctrines and moral precepts of the great Hebrew teachers; it cannot spare the earnest and masterful spirit of the Teutonic race. If any one of these elements were taken from modern civilization, it would be something wholly different from what it is.

14. Celts, Slavonians, and Other Peoples. — Having noticed the Romans and the Teutons, the two most prominent and important of the peoples that present themselves to us at the time of the downfall of Rome, if we now name the Celts, the Slavs, the Persians, the Arabians, and the Turanian or Tartar tribes of Asia, we shall have under view the chief actors in the drama of mediæval and of a large part of modern history.

At the commencement of the mediæval era the Celts were in front of the Teutons, clinging to the western edge of the European continent, and engaged in a bitter contest with these latter peoples, which, in the antagonism of England and Ireland, was destined to extend itself to our own day.

The Slavs or Slavonians were in the rear of the Teutonic tribes, pressing them on even as the Celts in front were struggling to resist their advance. These peoples, progressing but little beyond the pastoral stage before the Modern Age, will play only an obscure part in the transactions of the mediæval era, but in the course of the modern period will assume a most commanding position among the European nations.

The Persians were in their old seats beyond the Euphrates, maintaining there what is called the New Persian Empire, the *kings of which, until* the rise of the Saracens in the seventh

century, were the most formidable rivals of the emperors of Constantinople.

The Arabians were hidden in their deserts; but in the seventh century we shall see them, animated by a wonderful religious enthusiasm, issue from their peninsula, and begin a contest with the Christian nations of the East and the West which, in its varying phases, was destined to fill a large part of the mediæval period.

The Tartar tribes were buried in Central Asia. They will appear late in the eleventh century, proselytes for the most part of Mohammedanism; and, as the religious ardor of the Semitic Arabians grows cool, we shall see the Crescent upheld by these zealous converts of another race, and finally, in the fifteenth century, placed by the Ottoman Turks upon the dome of St. Sophia in Constantinople.

As the Middle Ages draw to a close, the remote nations of Eastern Asia will gradually come within our circle of vision; and, as the Modern Age dawns, we shall catch a glimpse of new continents and strange races of men beyond the Atlantic.

A SUGGESTION TO TEACHERS. — HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

The teacher will find historical analysis a most instructive and inspiring exercise for his class. The pupils should first be given as a subject to examine and analyze their own city or village community, and be encouraged to find answers to such questions as these : What different races or nationalities make up the population? Are there any Græco-Roman elements here in the architecture? In the libraries, public or private? In the museums? In the schools and colleges? In the municipal government? In the laws? Is there anything here, either along the streets, or within or outside the homes, that would be familiar to a visitor from ancient Athens or Rome? Anything from Judæa? What about the churches? The Sabbath? What spirit is at work in the hospitals and the various charities of the place? Whence the various religious ideas, social customs, and moral ideals that are moulding the life of the community?

After having dealt in this manner with something near at hand, the members of the class should be led to apply the same analytical method to civilizations, historical institutions, and epochs of history. To this end let such questions as these be proposed : What elements do you find in our civilization which are not present in the Chinese? In the Mohammedan? What historical factors do you find in the Monasteries? In the Papacy? In Feudalism? In the Free Cities? In the Holy Roman Empire? What forces were at work in the Renaissance?

Through the adoption of such a field or laboratory method of investigation the teacher will enable his pupils to gain a wholly new conception of history, and one that will make the study of it inspiring and profitable.

PART I — THE MIDDLE AGES

FIRST PERIOD — THE DARK AGES

(From the Fall of Rome, A.D. 476, to the Eleventh Century)

CHAPTER I

MIGRATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS OF THE TEUTONIC TRIBES

15. The Period of the Migration. — In the closing chapters of an earlier volume we gave a short account of the beginnings of that movement among the northern Germanic tribes known as the "Great Migration," or the "Wandering of the Nations." We there traced the story of the invaders and destroyers of the old Roman empire in the West from the memorable year A.D. 376, the year in which the Goths swarmed over the Danube into the Roman provinces, until just a hundred years later, when the last Roman emperor in the West was dethroned by the barbarian Odovakar (Odoacer).

At the time that this event occurred (A.D. 476) almost all the Roman territories of the West were in the hands of the barbarians. But the invasion was by no means yet over. For more than a hundred years longer the German tribes were on the move. From the depths of Germany new nations were constantly pushing across the old frontiers. The tribal monarchies already established on Roman soil were continually shifting their boundaries, or were disappearing, only to be replaced by new ones equally unstable.

Resuming our narrative at the point where we dropped it in our history of Rome, we shall in the present chapter trace in broad outline the history of these barbarian kingdoms down to the time when, at the close of the eighth century, the establishment of the wide empire of Charlemagne, or Charles the Great, gave a more settled character to the society of Western Europe and marked in a certain way the beginning of a new order of things.

16. Kingdom of the Ostrogoths (A.D. 493–553). — As soon as Odovakar had dethroned Romulus Augustulus, he seized upon and divided among his followers the estates of the wealthy Italian nobles. His feeble government lasted seventeen years, when it was brought to a close by the invasion of the Ostrogoths (Eastern Goths), under Theodoric, the greatest of their chiefs.

The Ostrogoths came from the region of the Lower Danube. They were, at this time, nominal allies of the Eastern emperor, and had been assigned the duty of guarding the Danubian frontier. But they were very troublesome and costly friends. Theodoric was constantly breaking his engagements with the emperor, who was obliged to purchase his good-will with constant gifts of land and money. At last, after he had, by his plundering forays, converted into waste land much of Thrace and Macedonia, Theodoric asked of the emperor permission to lead an expedition to the conquest of Italy, promising, if he succeeded in the enterprise, to rule the Italians in his name.[1]

The emperor gladly granted the permission sought; and the entire Ostrogothic nation, numbering probably over 200,000 souls, — men, women, and children, — set out for Italy. It was a migration rather than a military expedition. Italy was not

[1] This is the Gothic account of the matter; the Byzantine version represents the emperor Zeno as himself suggesting to Theodoric the project of the invasion. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. iii, pp. 128–130. Oxford, 1895.

simply to be plundered, as when Alaric led the Visigoths over the Alps, but to be occupied as a permanent possession; so the train of the migrating nation was lengthened by their flocks and herds, and by clumsy wagons, twenty thousand in number, it is said, loaded with such property as make up the riches of a roving people.

From their seats on the Danube to the northern plains of Italy was a long and broken march of seven hundred miles. The snow and cold of a winter of unusual severity, and hostile bands of the Gepidæ and other tribes impeded and harassed their march. But the genius and daring of Theodoric, who animated his followers with his own intrepid spirit, and encouraged them with prospects of the rich booty that awaited them, surmounted every obstacle; and in the spring of the year A.D. 489, the inhabitants of Italy were again startled by the apparition of a Gothic host issuing from the defiles of the Julian Alps.

Odovakar and his followers made an heroic defense of their dominions. But after a struggle of three years, during which time Italy suffered all the evils incident to barbarian warfare, the contest was ended by the surrender of Ravenna (A.D. 493). Odovakar was taken captive, and at a banquet was murdered by Theodoric in a manner so hideously treacherous that when the unhappy man realized the perfidy of which he was the helpless victim he is said to have cried out, "Where is God?"

Theodoric now assumed the sovereignty of all Italy, and, in fulfillment of the promises he had made his followers, distributed among them one-third of the best lands of the peninsula. His reign lasted thirty-three years, — years for the most part of such quiet and prosperity as Italy had not known since the happy era of the Antonines. The king made good his famous declaration: "Our purpose is, God helping us, so to rule that our subjects shall grieve that they did not earlier acquire the blessing of our dominion."

Theodoric's chief minister and adviser was Cassiodorus, a statesman and writer of Roman birth, whose constant effort was to effect a union of the conquerors and the conquered, and thus to establish in Italy a strong and permanent Romano-Gothic state under the rule of the royal house of the Ostrogoths. Could this have been brought about, Italy might have been spared all those centuries of suffering which resulted from the efforts first of the emperors of the East (par. 62) and then of the German emperors (par. 364) to make the country a part of their respective empires, and the Ostrogothic kings, instead of the Frankish princes, might have played the part of reorganizers of the shattered society of the West.

The dominions of Theodoric, gradually extended by conquests and negotiations, finally embraced the fairest provinces formerly ruled by the Western Roman emperors. Italy, Sicily, part of Southern Gaul, and the countries between the head of the Adriatic and the Danube, acknowledged the authority of the Gothic king. And such was the reputation of Theodoric for wisdom and fairness, that the disputes of all the neighboring Teutonic nations were referred to him for arbitration. The last years of his reign, however, notwithstanding Theodoric's generally humane and tolerant disposition, were embittered by religious quarrels, and stained by his acts of cruelty and persecution.

Among the victims of his injustice were the renowned Boethius, and Symmachus, his venerable father-in-law, the two most distinguished scholars of that time, who were both put to death on what seems to have been an unfounded, or at least unproved, charge of disloyalty. Boethius, during the months of imprisonment which preceded his execution, wrote his *Philosophiae Consolatio*, or "Consolation of Philosophy," a work that possessed a most remarkable attraction for a certain class of minds throughout the Middle Ages.

Theodoric died in the year A.D. 526, eaten by remorse, it is *said, especially* for his unjust condemnation of Symmachus.


EUROPE
IN THE REIGN OF
THEODORIC
About A.D. 500
Roman Empire
Celts
Teutonic Settlements
Eboracum (York)
Londinium (London)
Cologne
Trier
Mainz
Metz
Paris
Orleans
Tours
Lyons
Geneva
Milan
Ravenna
Salona
Bordeaux
Toulouse
Arles
Nice
Narbonne
Barcelona
Toledo
Cordova
Gibraltar
Carthage
Naples
ROME
CORSICA
SARDINIA
BALEARIC Is.
Pannonia
Danube
Elbe R.
Rhine R.
Ebro R.
Tagus R.
Guadiana R.
Guadalquivir R.
Str. of
SUEVIAN KINGM
BURGUNDIAN KINGM
EAST GOTHIC KINGDOM
WEST GOTHIC KINGDOM
VANDAL KINGDOM
FRANKISH KINGDOM
Saxons
Angles
Jutes
Thuringia
Saxons
Picts
Scots
L.L. Postes, Engr., N.Y.


20
25
30
35
40
45
50
55
60
65
70
55
50
45
40
35
30
25
Sea of
Huns
Caspian
Sea
Cherson
THRACE
MACEDONIA
Constantinople
PONTUS
Trapezus
(Trebizond)
Theodosiopolis
Nicæa
Thessalonica
ILLYRICUM
ASIA
Armenia
Melitene
Amida
Nisibis
Thebarmes
Nineveh
PERSIAN
KINGDOM
Antioch
Ctesiphon
CRETE
Alexandria
Ella
THE EAST
Ghassanides
Lachmides
Saracens
EGYPT
Medina
Mecca

Like many another great ruler and leader of men, he had lived too long for his fame. His massive mausoleum stands in Ravenna to-day.

The kingdom established by the rare abilities of Theodoric lasted only twenty-seven years after his death. It was destroyed by the generals of Justinian, the emperor of the East (par. 62); and Italy, freed from the barbarians, was for a time reunited to the empire (A.D. 553).

17. Kingdom of the Visigoths (A.D. 415–711). — The Visigoths (Western Goths) were already in possession of Southern Gaul and the greater part of Spain when the Roman empire in the West was brought to an end by the act of Odovacar and his companions. The name of Euric (A.D. 466–483) holds the same place of preëminence among their kings as does that of Theodoric among the Ostrogothic princes. His fame was spread not only throughout Europe, but even reached some of the most distant countries of Asia.

Being driven south of the Pyrenees by the kings of the Franks, the Visigoths held their possessions in Spain until the beginning of the eighth century, when the Saracens crossed the Straits of Gibraltar (par. 90), destroyed the kingdom of Roderic, the last of the Gothic kings, and established in the peninsula the authority of the Koran (A.D. 711). The Visigothic kingdom when thus overturned had lasted nearly three hundred years. During this time the conquerors had mingled with the old Romanized inhabitants of Spain, so that in the veins of the Spaniard of to-day is blended the blood of Iberian, Celt, Roman, and Teuton, together with that of the last intruder, the African Moor.

18. Kingdom of the Burgundians (A.D. 443–534). — Towards the middle of the fifth century the Burgundians, who were near kinsmen of the Goths, acquired, with the permission of the Romans, a permanent settlement in the territory now known as Savoy; and at length, by force of arms or by peaceful negotiations, possessed themselves of all the southeastern

portion of what is now the Republic of France, as well as considerable tracts of Western Switzerland. A portion of this ancient dominion still retains, from these German settlers, the name of "Burgundy." The Burgundians had barely secured a foothold in Gaul before they came in collision with the Franks on the north, and were reduced by Clovis and his sons to a state of dependence upon the northern kingdom.

19. **Kingdom of the Vandals** (A.D. 439–533). — About half a century before the fall of Rome, the Vandals, crowded from their seats in Pannonia, traversed Gaul and Spain, passed the Straits of Gibraltar, overran in a few years all Northern Africa, and made the city of Carthage the capital of the kingdom which they set up in those regions (A.D. 439).

These Vandal conquerors were animated by a more destructive energy than any other of the Germanic tribes that took part in the subversion of the Roman empire. Their very name has passed into all languages as the synonym of wanton destruction and violence. The terror of this name they spread throughout the Mediterranean countries. Their pirate ships swept all the waters between the Pillars of Hercules and the Nile. They carried their horses with them in their ships, and making a descent upon an unprotected coast, mounted the animals, scoured the country, gathered the booty into their vessels, and were away before an alarm could be sounded. Even walled cities did not escape the audacious attacks of these "Vikings of the South." In another volume [2] we have told how the Vandal king, Geiseric, bore in triumph down the Tiber the heavy spoils of Rome itself.

Nor did the Vandal pirates content themselves with plundering excursions. They emulated the ambition and imitated the conquests of the Carthaginians, whose ancient capital they had made their own. Besides conquering all North Africa, they seized Corsica, Sardinia, and the Balearic Isles. And not satisfied with reducing their enemies to political servitude with

[2] *Rome: its Rise and Fall*, par. 279.

the heavy blows of their swords, they endeavored to subjugate them spiritually with the same weapon. Being Arian Christians, they persecuted with furious zeal and unrelenting cruelty the orthodox party, the followers of Athanasius. No more cruel persecution stains the pages of history than that waged by these semi-Christian Vandals against the African Catholics.

But vengeance was at hand. The Vandals had but just effected the conquest of Sardinia when the general who had accomplished this undertaking was sent for in haste to return to the defense of Africa. The emperor Justinian had sent his general, Belisarius, to drive the barbarians from Africa and to restore that province to the bosom of the true Catholic Church. The expedition was successful, and Carthage and the fruitful fields of Africa were restored to the empire, after having suffered the insolence of the barbarian conquerors for the space of more than a hundred years (par. 61).

Many of the Vandals now enlisted in the army of the Eastern emperor, while others engaged in different enterprises, the hazardous nature of which struck their savage imagination. Those remaining in the country were gradually absorbed by the native population, and after a few generations no certain trace of the barbarian invaders could be detected in the physical appearance, the language, or the customs of the inhabitants of the African coast. The Vandal nation had disappeared; the name alone remained.

20. The Franks under the Merovingians (A.D. 486–752).— The Franks, who were destined to give a new name to Gaul and form the nucleus of the French nation, made their first settlements west of the Rhine about two hundred years before the fall of Rome. At the time of that event they were still pagans, and seem to have made little or no advance on any lines beyond that stage of civilization which the German tribes had reached in the days of Tacitus.

The Franks were divided into two branches or groups of tribes, known respectively as the Ripuarians and the Salians.

The Salians were the leading nation, and it was from the members of their most powerful family who traced their descent from Merowig, an early chieftain of the race, that leaders were chosen by the free vote of all the warriors. Among their several kings at this time was Clovis, or Chlodwig, a man possessing a disposition cruel and treacherous even far beyond that of his perfidious house.

After the downfall of Rome, Clovis conceived the ambition of erecting a kingdom upon the ruins of the Roman power. He attacked Syagrius, the Roman governor of Gaul, and at Soissons gained a decisive victory over his forces (A.D. 486). Thus was destroyed forever in Gaul that Roman authority established among its barbarous tribes more than five centuries before by the conquests of Julius Cæsar. A few years later Clovis came into possession of Paris, so named from an ancient Celtic tribe known as the Parisii, and made it his favorite dwelling-place.

Clovis in a short time extended his authority over the greater part of Gaul, reducing to the condition of tributaries the various Teutonic tribes that had taken possession of different portions of the country. Success won for him friends on every hand. The Catholic bishops espoused with all the weight of their authority, which was not small, the cause of Clovis, hoping in return to receive his support in their contest with the pagan and heretical enemies of the Church. In this they were not disappointed, as we shall see a little later.

Furthermore, the emperor at Constantinople sent the Frankish king the purple robe and other insignia of a Roman consul, thereby clothing him with all the authority of the imperial government. Clovis in accepting these became the lieutenant or viceroy of the Eastern emperor only in name; his authority was really as untrammeled and absolute as that of the most independent prince. But this formal recognition of the sovereignty of the court at Constantinople, which during

all this period was acknowledged by almost all the German chiefs of the West, while it amused the Eastern emperor, and laid no burdens or restrictions upon the barbarian princes, rather strengthened the authority of the latter among their own people, and especially among the former subjects of the empire, who still reverenced the name of Rome, and looked upon the emperor and those clothed with his delegated authority with an almost superstitious veneration.

Clovis stained the closing years of his reign with the most atrocious crimes. Upon his death (A.D. 511) his extensive dominions, in accordance with the ancient Teutonic law of inheritance, were divided among his four sons. The natural consequences of such a parceling out of the supreme authority soon followed, and the kingdom was rent with dissensions and wars. About a century and a half of discord followed the energetic rule of Clovis,[8] by the end of which time the Merovingians had become so feeble and inefficient that they were contemptuously called *rois fainéants*, or "do-nothing kings," and the ambitious members of other families that had grown rich and influential through their connection with the court and government were encouraged to aspire to the royal dignity.

Now the Frankish monarchy at this time was composed of two chief members, an eastern and a western division, known respectively as *Austrasia* and *Neustria*, which represented in a vague way the Germany and France of later times. The eastern division, as was natural on account of its position, was more thoroughly Teutonic than the western, where the Roman element predominated. Naturally there existed an irreconcilable antagonism between the two members of the Frankish state. At the head of each division was a high officer of the crown known as Mayor of the Palace (*Major Domus*). After a long contest the mayors of the eastern

[8] Dagobert I (628–638) was the last noteworthy ruler during this period. His rule, for he ruled as well as reigned, marked the culmination of the personal power of the Merovingians.

division gained the ascendency, pushed aside the weak Merovingian kings, and gave to the Frankish monarchy a new royal line, — the Carolingian.

It required the genius, the achievements, and the ambition of three successive princes, Pippin II, Charles Martel, and Pippin III, father, son, and grandson, to lift the aspiring Austrasian family to fully acknowledged royal dignity, although Pippin II by a great victory over the Neustrians at Testry (A.D. 687) secured such an ascendency in the monarchy that he thenceforth really exercised royal power, notwithstanding that a Merovingian prince still sat as a shadow-king upon the throne.

Charles, son of Pippin, by his genius, energy, and splendid services, raised to a more secure eminence the growing fortunes of the family. Never did ambition have presented to it a rarer opportunity.

The Saracens, of whom we shall tell in a following chapter, having reduced the East, North Africa, and Spain, had crossed the Pyrenees into Aquitaine, or Southern Gaul, and were threatening the subjugation of all Europe. The eyes of everybody were turned to Charles as the only one whose arm was powerful enough to stay the insolent progress of the Arab hosts.

Charles gathered his warriors, and on the field of Tours, or Poitiers, in Central France inflicted upon the invaders a most memorable defeat, thus saving Europe from the Mohammedan yoke (A.D. 732). From his exploits on this famous field Charles gained such renown and ascendency that he, like his father before him, became virtually the king of the Franks, although the honor of bearing that title was reserved for his son Pippin, who in a way that will hereafter be explained in another connection (par. 99) became the first in name of the Carolingian kings (A.D. 752).

At this point we must turn from tracing the growing power of the Franks, in order to follow the fortunes of other invaders of the empire.

21. Kingdom of the Lombards (A.D. 568–774). — The circumstances attending the establishment of the Lombards in Italy were very like those marking the settlement of the Ostrogoths. The Lombards (Longobardi), so called probably either from their long beards or their long battle-axes, came from the region of the Middle Danube, where they had long been in the employ of the Eastern emperor, engaged in a war of extermination against the Gepidæ. From this enterprise, which well suited their fierce and martial character, they turned to the conquest of Italy. This country, it will be borne in mind, had but recently been delivered from the hands of the Ostrogoths by the lieutenants of the Eastern emperor (par. 16).

In just such a march as the Ostrogoths had made nearly a century before, the Lombard nation under the lead of their king, Alboin, now crossed the Alps and descended into the plain of the Po, where the land was almost bare of inhabitants through the frightful devastations of the Gothic wars (par. 62). After many years of fighting, they subjugated a large part of the peninsula, and established a monarchy which lasted almost exactly two centuries. The parts of the country which they were not able to conquer were in general the cities on the seacoast, as well as Rome and the southern portion of the peninsula.

The Lombards were, after the Vandals, the most untamed of all the tribes that fell upon the Roman provinces, and their conquests were attended with the most appalling slaughters and cruelties. The story of Alboin and Rosamund is a typical one. Alboin had slain in battle a rival chieftain, the king of the Gepidæ, whose beautiful daughter, Rosamund, he had just taken as a bride. At a banquet in celebration of his victories he forced his young queen to drink wine from her father's skull, which he had had made into a drinking-cup. In revenge for the insult, Rosamund plotted the death of her husband and then married the murderer.

Insensibly, however, the restraints of the new religion which the Lombards had embraced, and the softening influences of the civilization with which they had come in contact in Italy overcame their self-will and tamed their fierce dispositions, so that in process of time they became the representatives of a higher morality and the generous patrons of art and learning.

When they entered Italy the Lombards were Christians of the Arian sect; but in time they became converts to the orthodox faith of the Roman Church, and Pope Gregory I bestowed upon the Lombard king an iron crown, in which was wrought what was believed to be one of the nails of the cross upon which Christ had suffered.

The kingdom of the Lombards was destroyed by Charles the Great, the most noted of the Frankish rulers, in the year 774; but the blood of the invaders had by this time become intermingled with that of the former subjects of the empire, so that throughout all that part of the peninsula which is still called Lombardy after them, one will to-day occasionally see the fair hair and light complexion which reveal the strain of German blood in the veins of the present inhabitants.

One important result of the Lombard conquest of Italy was the destruction of the political unity established by the Romans, and the breaking up of the country into a multitude of petty states. This resulted from the extreme feudal character of the Lombard monarchy, which caused it to disintegrate into a number of practically independent duchies, and from the failure of the invaders to get possession of Rome and all the shore lands of the peninsula. Thus an impulse was given to disintegration which was never overcome during the Middle Ages. The peninsula became crowded with independent city-republics and principalities. Not until our own day did there emerge from this political chaos a united Italy.

22. The Anglo-Saxon Conquest of Britain. — In the fifth century of our era, being then engaged in her death struggle with the barbarians, Rome withdrew her legions from Britain,

in order to protect Italy. Thus that province was left exposed to the attacks of the Picts[4] and Scots, as well as to the depredations of the Anglo-Saxon corsairs. The Picts of Caledonia made plundering raids over the Hadrian Wall in the north; the Scots of Ireland descended in their piratical crafts upon the western, and the Saxon pirates upon the eastern shores of the island.

In this extremity of affairs the provincials are said to have appealed for aid to the Roman governor of Gaul, picturing, in a supplication known as "The Groans of the Britons," their condition in these terms: "The barbarians drive us into the sea; the sea throws us back upon the swords of the barbarians; and we have only the hard choice of perishing by the sword or by the waves." The appeal, if ever made, was unavailing, for the Roman legions were just then battling with the terrible hosts of Alaric and Attila, and could extend no help.

The distressed Britons were driven to what proved a fatal device. They determined to make friends of a part of their foes by means of bribes in land and money, and then turn these against the rest of their enemies. The German pirates were gained over by the means suggested. Hengist and Horsa, two half legendary Jutish chiefs, were the leaders of the first bands that came (A.D. 449). They were given as a base of operations the Isle of Thanet, at the mouth of the Thames, and the Picts were soon driven back into their northern fastnesses. Reports of the settlement, and glowing accounts of the richness of the soil and the delightfulness of the climate of the new land, caused fresh shiploads of the kinsmen of the colonists to join them. The new immigrants were Saxons, Angles, and Jutes, tribes of very near kin, that came from Jutland and the country along the lower courses of the Elbe and the Weser.

The Britons became alarmed at the increasing swarms of ships and men, and, when too late, realized that they had

[4] The Picts were earlier known as Caledonians. They were a mixed Celto-Iberian race.

made a grave mistake in giving these fierce warriors a foothold in their country. They now, either through deliberate purpose or because the number of the strangers had become so great that they were not able to make good their pledges to them, withheld promised lands and provisions. Thereupon the newcomers resolved to help themselves. They attacked the Britons, overthrew them in a terrible battle, and began to take possession of the island. We say began, for neither the generation that commenced the work of subjugating the island, nor yet the three succeeding ones, saw the conquest nearly effected. The advance of the invaders was disputed foot by foot, and a hundred and more years passed away before the Teutons had secured possession of even the eastern half of what now forms England.[5] No other province of the Roman empire made such determined and heroic resistance against the barbarians. Up to the close of the sixth century — after that date the struggle grew less savage and unrelenting — so bitter and desperate was the contest that the provincials were either exterminated, reduced to serfdom, or driven bodily westward. Almost every trace of Roman civilization was obliterated. The Christian religion, which had been introduced during the Roman sway, was virtually swept away, and Teutonic England again fell back into the paganism in which Julius Cæsar had found its tribes six hundred years before.

There is no more tragic story in all history than that which tells how our pagan ancestors dispossessed the Christian Britons of their fair island, and drove them among the mountains of Wales or across the water to other lands.[6] It is to this period of desperate struggle that the famous King Arthur belongs. The legends that have gathered about the name

[5] The battle of Deorham (A.D. 577) marks a turning-point in the struggle, since the victory they won here gave the Saxons control of the valley of the Severn, and thrust a wedge between the Celts of Cornwall and their kinsmen of Wales and the North. See map, p. 140.

[6] Many of the hard-pressed Britons fled across the English Channel to the adjacent shores of France, and gave name to the French province of Brittany.

of this national hero are mostly mythical; yet it is possible that he had a real existence, and that the name represents one or more of the most valiant of the Celtic chiefs who battled so long and heroically against the pagan invaders.

Although the conquerors of Britain belonged, as we have learned, to three Teutonic tribes, — the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, — they all passed among the Celts under the name of Saxons, and among themselves, after they began to draw together into a single nation, under that of Angles, whence the name England (Angle-land).

By the close of the sixth century the invading bands had set up in the conquered parts of the island eight or nine, or perhaps more, kingdoms, — frequently designated, though somewhat inaccurately, as the *Heptarchy*, — among which three, Northumbria, Mercia, and Wessex by name, enjoyed a sort of preëminence, and formed the centers about which the smaller states tended to group themselves. For the space of two hundred years there was an almost perpetual strife among these leading states for supremacy, the king first of one and then of another forcing from one or both of the others a more or less perfect acknowledgment of his overlordship. Finally, Egbert (802–839),[7] king of Wessex, whose ambitious projects were favored by a growing sense of the advantages of a national union, and by the fear occasioned by the descent upon the coast of Scandinavian pirates, brought all the other states to a subject or tributary condition, and became in reality, though he seems never, save on one occasion, to have actually assumed the title, the first king of England.[8]

[7] Egbert had passed thirteen years as an exile at the court of Charles the Great and had witnessed his coronation as emperor in the year 800 (par. 102). He thus learned important lessons in the arts of war and government, and doubtless was inspired with the ambition to imitate in England Charles's great work on the Continent.

[8] The title given him in the Saxon *Chronicle* is that of *Bretwalda*, which is sometimes rendered "Wielder of Britain." The *Chronicle* also states that Egbert was the eighth and last king to bear this title.

23. Teutonic Tribes outside the Empire. — We have now spoken of the most important of the Teutonic tribes that forced themselves within the limits of the Roman empire in the West, and that there, upon the ruins of the civilization they had overthrown, laid or helped to lay the foundations of the modern nations of Italy, Spain, France, and England. Beyond the boundaries of the old empire were still other tribes and clans of this same mighty family of nations, — tribes and clans that were destined to play great parts in European history.

On the east, beyond the Rhine, were the ancestors of the modern Germans. Notwithstanding the immense hosts that the forests and morasses of Germany had poured into the Roman provinces, the Fatherland, in the sixth century of our era, seemed still as crowded as before the great migration began. These tribes were yet barbarians in manners, and, for the most part, pagans in religion.

In the northwest of Europe were the Scandinavians, the ancestors of the modern Danes, Swedes, and Norwegians. They were as yet untouched either by the civilization or the religion of Rome. We shall scarcely get a glimpse of them before the ninth century, when they will appear as "Norsemen," the dreaded corsairs of the northern seas (chap. viii).

Sources and Source Material. — *The Letters of Cassiodorus* (trans. by Thomas Hodgkin). Read bk. i, Letters 24 and 35; bk. ii, Letters 32 and 34; bk. iii, Letters 17, 19, 29, 31, and 43; bk. xi, Letters 12 and 13; bk. xii, Letter 20. These letters are invaluable in showing what was the general condition of things in the transition period between ancient and mediæval times. Hodgkin has also given us in his great work mentioned below numerous extracts from the sources for this period. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Bohn). Consult entries for the years 455–827. BOETHIUS, *Consolation of Philosophy* (Bohn). "Whoso would understand," says Hodgkin, "the thoughts that were working in the noblest minds of the mediæval Europe would do well to give a few hours' study to the once world-renowned 'Consolation of Philosophy.'" Colby's *Selections from the Sources of English History*, Extract 5,

"The Coming of the English to Britain," from Bæda's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*. Lee's *Source-Book of English History*, chap. iv. *Studies in European History* (University of Nebraska), vol. ii, No. 2, "Teutonic Barbarians."

Secondary or Modern Works. — HODGKIN (T.), ** *Italy and her Invaders*, 8 vols. The first four volumes have appeared in a revised edition. Hodgkin is recognized as the best authority on the period of the migration. His style is unusually attractive. Read vol. iii, bk. iv, chap. xii, pp. 517–572, "Boethius and Symmachus." By the same author, **Theodoric the Goth* (Heroes of the Nations). GUMMERE (F. B.), ***Germanic Origins*. An authoritative and interesting work on the early culture of the Germans. SHEPPARD (J. G.), *The Fall of Rome and the Rise of the New Nationalities*. Selected chapters. GIBBON (E.), *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chaps. xxxviii and xxxix. CHURCH (R. W.), *The Beginning of the Middle Ages* (Epoch Series), chaps. i–v. EMERTON (E.), *An Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages*, chaps. vi and vii. GREEN (J. R.), *The Making of England*, and the same author's *Short History of the English People* (new ed., 1899), chap. i. CHURCH (A. J.), *Early Britain* (Story of the Nations), chaps. x–xvii, pp. 92–184. OMAN (C.), *The Dark Ages*, chaps. i, ii, iv, vii, viii, x, and xi. KITCHIN (G. W.), *History of France* (4th ed., 1898), vol. i, pp. 1–181. KINGSLEY (C.), **The Roman and the Teuton*. This work is sure to stir the interest of the young reader. It is, however, subjective, as opposed to objective, history.

CHAPTER II

THE CONVERSION OF THE BARBARIANS

24. Introductory. — The most important event in the history of the tribes that took possession of the Roman empire in the West was their conversion to Christianity. The facility with which they exchanged their primitive beliefs for the new faith may be attributed, in part at least, to two causes, — the excellence of the religion that was offered for their acceptance, and the loose hold they had upon their own. "Those who have no homes for themselves," says Montesquieu, "were never known to build temples, and those peoples who have no temples have but a small attachment to their own religion." The Teutons, before they entered the empire, were without fixed homes or temples. The woods and groves, Tacitus observes, were their only shrines. As they readily abandoned old seats and went in search of others, so did they lightly give up old beliefs and embrace new ones. Furthermore, they were almost, if not quite, without written records; and races whose religion is merely traditional and not yet embalmed in a written literature, will more readily give it up in exchange for a new one than those whose faith is conserved by the authority of books venerable through age, and sacred by virtue of mysterious or forgotten origin.

We shall now notice some of the incidents and features of the great victory gained by Christianity over the barbarian subverters of the Roman empire, — a peaceful victory much more worthy of our attention than many a triumph of a more martial nature.

25. Progress of Christianity before the Fall of Rome. — By the end of the fourth century Christianity had achieved its first great victory. It had triumphed practically over pagan and skeptical Rome. As early as A.D. 313 Constantine had proclaimed it the favored religion of the empire. But the zeal of the missionaries of the new faith did not permit them to stop at the boundaries that circumscribed the Roman state; for they were the ambassadors of a universal kingdom which recognized none of the dividing lines of nations. They crossed all the frontiers of the Roman dominion, and taught the new doctrines in Ireland and Scotland, beneath the forests of Germany, and upon the plains of Scythia. By the opening of the fifth century the empire of Christianity was far ampler than that of the Cæsars had ever been.

To this circumstance of the barbarians' conversion before or soon after their entrance into the empire, its subjects owed their immunity from the excessive cruelties which rude pagan barbarians never fail to inflict upon a subjected enemy. Alaric left untouched the treasures of the churches of the Roman Christians, because his own faith was also Christian. For like reason the Vandal king, Geiseric, yielded to the prayers of Pope Leo the Great, and spared the lives of the inhabitants of the Imperial City.[1] The more tolerable fate of Italy, Spain, and Gaul, as compared with the hard fate of Britain, is owing, in part at least, to the fact that the tribes which overran those countries had become in the main converts to Christianity before they crossed the boundaries of the empire, while the Saxons when they entered Britain were still untamed pagans.

26. Conversion of the Goths, Vandals, and other Tribes. — The first converts to Christianity among the barbarians beyond the limits of the empire were won from among the Goths. Probably the pioneer missionaries among these tribes were captives taken by them in their raids across the Danube. Foremost of the apostles that arose among them was Ulfilas, who translated

[1] *Rome: its Rise and Fall* (pars. 273 and 279).

the Scriptures into the Gothic language, omitting from his version, however, "the Books of the Kings,"[2] as he feared that the stirring recital of wars and battles in that portion of the Word might kindle into too fierce a flame the martial ardor of his new converts.

What happened in the case of the Goths happened also in the case of most of the barbarian tribes that participated in the overthrow of the Roman empire in the West. By the time of the fall of Rome the Gothic and other barbarian mercenaries then in Italy; the Vandals, who had traversed the length of the empire and were in Africa; the Suevi, who had crossed the Pyrenees and entered Spain; the Burgundians, who had established themselves in Southeastern Gaul, — all these had become proselytes to Christianity. The greater part of them, however, professed the Arian creed, which had been condemned by the great council of the Church held at Nicæa during the reign of Constantine the Great (A.D. 325). Hence they were regarded as heretics by the Catholic Church, and all had to be reconverted to the orthodox creed, which thing was gradually and almost perfectly effected.

The remaining Teutonic tribes of whose conversion we shall speak — the Franks, the Anglo-Saxons, the Scandinavians, and the chief tribes of Germany — embraced at the outset the Catholic faith.

27. Conversion of the Franks. — The Franks, when they entered the empire, like the Angles and Saxons when they landed in Britain, were still pagans. Christianity gained way very slowly among them until a conviction that the God of the Christians had intervened in their behalf led the king and nation to adopt the new religion in place of their old faith. The circumstances, as reported by tradition, were these. In a terrible battle between the Franks under their king Clovis and the Alemanni, the situation of the Franks at length

[2] I and II Samuel and I and II Kings. "This was the first translation of the Bible into a barbarian tongue." — HODGKIN.

became desperate. Then Clovis, falling upon his knees, called upon the God of the Christians, whose faith his good Queen Clotilda had often sought to persuade him to embrace, and solemnly vowed that if He would give victory to his arms, he would become His faithful follower, and ever maintain His cause with his sword. The battle soon turned in favor of the Franks, and Clovis, faithful to his vow, was baptized, and with him three thousand of his warriors. "Bow thy neck in meekness, O Sicambrian," said the pious Archbishop Remigius to the kneeling Clovis; "adore what thou hast burned, and burn what thou hast adored."

This story of the conversion of Clovis and his Franks illustrates how the very superstitions of the barbarians, their belief in omens and divine interpositions, and particularly their feeling that if their gods did not do for them all they wanted done they had a right to set them aside and choose others in their stead, contributed to their conversion. The terror occasioned by a desolating plague caused the Bulgarians to seek refuge and relief by a profession of the Christian faith. In like manner the Burgundians, when sorely pressed by their enemies, thinking their own gods were offended or were powerless to aid them, embraced in a body the religion of the Christians. Thus the reception of the new faith was often a tribal or national affair, rather than a matter of personal conviction.

28. Importance of the Conversion of the Franks. — "The conversion of the Franks," says the historian Milman, "was the most important event in its remote as well as its immediate consequences in European history." It was of such moment for the reason that the Franks embraced the orthodox Catholic faith, while almost all the other German tribes had embraced the heretical Arian creed. Thus they secured the favor of the Church of Rome and the good-will and support of their Roman subjects, who were Catholics. This brought it about that the affairs of the Frankish rulers

prospered greatly. Their dominions grew constantly wider, and their authority steadily increased, until the little Frankish principality became a great empire and the limited authority of the prince became the authority of an emperor ruling over almost all the West.

29. Augustine's Mission to England. — The Angles and Saxons were not converted to Christianity until about a century and a half after their first landing in Britain. The Celts who had been pushed westward among the mountains of Wales still retained the Christian faith which they had received during Roman times; but, as has been said, they felt little inclination to help these barbarians, who had robbed them of their fair island lands, to secure a title to the heavenly inheritance. The work of our forefathers' conversion was, in the main, the result of the missionary zeal of Irish monks and of the Roman see.

In the year 596 Pope Gregory I sent the monk Augustine with a band of forty companions to teach the Christian faith in Britain. Gregory had become interested in the inhabitants of that remote region in the following way. One day, some years before his elevation to the papal chair, he was passing through the slave-market at Rome, and noticed there some English captives, whose fine form and fair features awakened his curiosity respecting them. Inquiring of what nation they were, he was told that they were called Angles. "'Right,' said he, 'for they have an angelic face, and it becomes such to become coheirs with the angels in heaven. What is the name,' proceeded he, 'of the province from which they are brought?' It was replied that the natives of that province were called Deiri. 'Truly are they *De ira*,' said he, 'withdrawn from wrath and called to the mercy of Christ. How is the king of that province called?' They told him his name was Ælla; and he, alluding to the name, said, 'Alleluia, the praise of God the Creator, must be sung in those parts.'"[8]

[8] Bede's *Eccl. Hist.*, ii, 1 (Bohn).

The pious monk wished to set out at once himself as a missionary to the pagan peoples in whom his interest had thus been awakened; but duties at the capital hindered him. When, however, a little while afterwards he was elected pope, still mindful of the incident of the slave-market, he sent to the Angles the embassy to which we have alluded.

Not less interesting than the story of the inception of the commission to the tribes of Britain is that of the manner in which the natives received the embassy. At this time Ethelbert of Kent was overlord of several of the little kingdoms that had grown up in the island. Now it so happened that his queen, Bertha, being a Frankish princess, was a follower of the faith that had already been received by the Franks, and through her influence the king received Augustine and his companions with open courtesy, listened attentively to the appeals of the monk, and finally yielding to the persuasions of his eloquence, embraced with his people the Christian faith. And so it came to pass that our forefathers were first called Christians at Canterbury, the capital of Kent, and from that day that city became the center of the religious life of England, and in time acquired a wide celebrity as the seat of one of the most famous cathedrals of Christendom.

A little while after the reception of Christianity by the king and people of Kent, the same faith was received in the kingdom of Northumbria. When the Christian messengers appealed to Edwin, the king of the Northumbrians, to embrace the religion of which they were the ambassadors, he called a council of his wise men, and submitted to them the question whether the old faith should be exchanged for the new. Then one of the aged counselors, whose words well illustrate the serious, thoughtful character of the Anglo-Saxon[4] spirit, arose in the assembly, and said: "O king, man's life is like a bird, that, driven by the storm, flees from the darkness

[4] Northumbria was settled by the Angles, but we shall, from this on, apply the designation Saxon, or Anglo-Saxon, to all the German settlers in Britain.

without and flying in by the open door flits for a few moments in the warmth and light of the dwelling, where the fire is glowing, and then hastily darts out again into the cold and darkness. Whence it comes, whither it goes, no one can tell. Such is the life of man. The soul for a few moments takes up her warm abode in this body; then quickly departs hence, but into what weal or woe no tongue has yet ever revealed to us. If then this mystery these strangers can tell us, heartily let us welcome them and listen to the tidings they bring." [5]

The result of the embassy and of the deliberations of the wise men was that the worship of Woden and Thor was abandoned, and the king and his people were baptized and confessed the Christian faith (A.D. 627).

30. The Celtic Church. — The bright prospects for the new faith in Northumbria were soon overclouded. King Edwin fell in battle with the pagan king of Mercia, and his kingdom sank back into heathenism. Soon, however, it was reconquered from Woden and won again for Christ, but this time not by Roman but by Celtic missionaries.

It here becomes necessary for us to say a word respecting the Celtic Church. Christianity, it must be borne in mind, held its place among the Romanized Celts whom the Saxons crowded slowly westward. Now, during the very period that England was being wrested from the Celtic warriors, the Celtic missionaries were effecting the spiritual conquest of Ireland. The struggle with the invaders was at its height when a zealous bishop, Patricius by name, better known as Saint Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, whose early years had been passed in captivity among the Irish, crossed over to the island as a missionary of the Cross. With such success were his labors attended that by the time of his death, which probably occurred towards the close of the fifth century, a large part of the island had embraced the Christian faith.

[5] Bede's *Eccl. Hist.*, ii, 13 (Bohn).

Never did any race receive the Gospel with more ardent enthusiasm. The Irish Church sent out its devoted missionaries into the Pictish highlands, into the forests of Germany, and among the wilds of Alps and Apennines. "For a time it seemed that the course of the world's history was to be changed; as if the older Celtic race that Roman and German had driven before them had turned to the moral conquest of their conquerors; as if Celtic, and not Latin, Christianity was to mould the destinies of the churches of the West." [6]

Among the numerous religious houses founded by the Celtic missionaries [7] was the famous monastery established A.D. 563 by the Irish monk Saint Columba, on the little isle of Iona, just off the Pictish coast. Iona became a most renowned center of Christian learning and missionary zeal, and for almost two centuries was the point from which radiated light through the darkness of the surrounding heathenism. Fitly has it been called the Nursery of Saints and the Oracle of the West.

31. The Celtic Mission to Northumbria (A.D. 635). — From this mother-monastery it was that went forth the missionaries destined to effect the reconquest of Northumbria. They came at the invitation of King Oswald, who, during a period of exile, had found an asylum in the cloisters of Iona.

The king gave the monks for the site of a monastery the isle, or peninsula, of Lindisfarne upon the Northumbrian coast, where the dash of the tempestuous Northern Sea must often have reminded them of the little storm-swept isle on the

[6] Green's *The Making of England*, p. 281. These Irish missionaries were not merely the representatives of Christianity. "They were instructors in every known branch of science and learning of the time, possessors and bearers of a higher culture than was at that period to be found anywhere on the Continent, and can surely claim to have been the pioneers, — to have laid the corner-stone of western culture on the Continent, the rich results of which Germany shares and enjoys to-day, in common with all other civilized nations." — ZIMMER, *The Irish Element in Mediæval Culture*, p. 130.

[7] In Southern Germany (now Switzerland) the Irish monk Gallus established (A.D. 613) the celebrated monastery of Saint Gall, which at a later time became one of the chief seats of learning in Central Europe.

opposite Atlantic shore. The work of the monks, fostered by Oswald's zeal, was crowned with abundant success, and Northumbria was soon won to the communion of the Celtic Church.

32. Rivalry between the Roman and the Celtic Church. — From the very moment that Augustine touched the shores of Britain and summoned the Welsh clergy to acknowledge the discipline of the Roman Church, there had been a growing jealousy between the Latin and Celtic Churches, which had now risen into the bitterest rivalry and strife. So long had the Celtic Church been cut off from all relations with Rome, that it had come to differ somewhat from it in the matter of certain ceremonies and observances, such as the time of keeping Easter and the form of the tonsure.[8]

33. The Council of Whitby (A.D. 664). — With a view to settling the quarrel, Oswy, king of Northumbria, who thought that "as they all expected the same kingdom of heaven, so they ought not to differ in the celebration of the divine mysteries," called a synod composed of representatives of both parties, at the famous monastery of Whitby.

The chief question of debate, which was argued before the king by the ablest advocates of both churches, was the proper time for the observance of Easter. The debate was warm, and hot words were exchanged. Finally, Wilfrid, the speaker for the Roman party, happening to quote the words of Christ to Peter, "To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven," the king asked the Celtic monks if these words were really spoken by Christ to that apostle, and upon their admitting that they were, Oswy said: "He being the doorkeeper, . . . I will in all things obey his decrees, lest when I come to the gates of the kingdom of heaven, there should be none to open them." [9]

The decision of the prudent Oswy gave the British Isles to Rome; for not only was all England soon won to the Roman

[8] In the Roman tonsure the top of the head was shaven, in the Celtic, the front part only.

[9] Bede's *Eccl. Hist.*, iii, 25 (Bohn).

side, but the churches and monasteries of Wales and Ireland and Scotland came in time to conform to the Roman standard and custom. "By the assistance of our Lord," says the pious Latin chronicler, "the monks were brought to the canonical observation of Easter, and the right mode of the tonsure."

34. The Roman Victory Fortunate for England. — It was very fortunate for England that the controversy turned as it did; for one of the most important of the destined consequences of the conversion of Britain was the reëstablishment of that connection of the island with Roman civilization which had been severed by the calamities of the fifth century. As Green says, — he is speaking of the embassy of Saint Augustine, — "The march of the monks as they chanted their solemn litany was in one sense a return of the Roman legions who withdrew at the trumpet call of Alaric. . . . Practically Augustine's landing renewed that union with the western world which the landing of Hengist had destroyed. The new England was admitted into the older Commonwealth of nations. The civilization, art, letters, which had fled before the sword of the English conquerors, returned with the Christian faith."

Now all this advantage would have been lost had Iona instead of Rome won at Whitby. England would have been isolated from the Continental world, and would have had no part or lot in that rich common life which was destined to the European peoples as coheirs of the heritage bequeathed to them by the dying empire.

A second valuable result of the Roman victory was the hastening of the political unity of England through its ecclesiastical unity. The Celtic Church, in marked contrast with the Latin, was utterly devoid of capacity for organization. It could have done nothing in the way of developing among the several Anglo-Saxon states the sentiment of nationality. On the other hand, the Roman Church, through the exercise of a central authority, through national synods and general

legislation, overcame the isolation of the different kingdoms, and helped powerfully to draw them together into a common political life.

35. Pagan and Christian Literature of the Anglo-Saxons. — Much light is cast upon our ancestors' change of religion by two famous poems which date from the Anglo-Saxon period of our literature. One of these, called *Beowulf*, was composed while our forefathers were yet pagans, and probably before they left the Continent; the other, known as the *Paraphrase of the Scriptures*, was written soon after their conversion to Christianity.

Beowulf is an epic poem which tells of the exploits of an heroic Viking, Beowulf by name, who delivers King Hrothgar and his Danes from the ravages of a terrible monster, called Grendel, a sort of northern Cyclops, who feasted upon sleeping men. It is alive with the instincts of paganism, and is a faithful reflection of the rough heathen times in which it had birth. Every passage displays the love of the savage for coarse horrors and brutal slaughters. Thus it runs: "The wretched wight [Grendel] seized quickly a sleeping warrior, slit him unawares, bit his bone-locker, drank his blood, in morsels swallowed him; soon had he all eaten, feet and fingers." Before another can be made a victim Beowulf closes with the monster. "The hall thundered, the ale of all the Danes and earls was spilt. Angry, fierce were the strong fighters, the hall was full of din. It was great wonder that the wine-hall stood above the warlike beasts, that the fair earth-house fell not to the ground."

Such was the gleeman's song which delighted our Saxon forefathers as they drank and caroused in their great mead-halls. They were barbarians, evidently, rough and fierce; yet their spirits were true and brave.

In striking contrast with the pagan hero-poem stands the *Paraphrase*, the first-fruits in English literature of the mission of Augustine. This poem, which was written some time in the seventh century, exhibits our ancestors as Christian converts,

studying and apparently appreciating the grand literature of the Hebrews. In it an Anglian monk, named Cædmon, upon whom the gift of song, according to legend, had been miraculously bestowed, sings with strange power and rapture, such as none of his race had known before him, the creation of the world, the fall of man, and all the long Bible story.

The *Paraphrase* reminds us of Milton's *Paradise Lost* (written a thousand years later), and pursues very much the same order in the treatment of its lofty theme. Hence Cædmon is sometimes called the "Saxon Milton." His poem was multiplied in manuscript copies, and for five centuries was read by all classes of Englishmen, being given an honored place alongside the Bible itself. The poet-monk thus did much to advance the cause of Christianity among our ancestors; for, by his verses, as says the Venerable Bede,[10] "the minds of many were often excited to despise the world, and to aspire to heaven."

36. Effect of Conversion upon the Martial Spirit of the Anglo-Saxons. — The conversion of England was effected chiefly through the labor of monks, and consequently it was the monastic form of Christianity that was introduced. The land became crowded with monasteries and nunneries. "More than thirty kings and queens," Trench affirms, "descended from the throne to end their days in cloistral retreats." Perhaps no other Teutonic tribes gave up so much of their native strength and martial energy, upon receiving Christianity, as did the Angles and Saxons of Britain. The practice of arms was, by a considerable part of the population, regarded with disfavor and wholly neglected.

[10] Bede the Venerable (about A.D. 673–735) was a pious and learned Northumbrian monk, who wrote, among other works, an invaluable one entitled *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* ("The Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation"). The work recites, as its central theme, the story of how our forefathers were won to the Christian faith. We are indebted to Bede for a large part of our knowledge of early England.

This decay of the martial spirit in a martial age, at a time when the independence and the very life of a nation depended upon its strength in arms, helped to bring upon England centuries of suffering and disaster. Of the ravages committed in the island by the Danes, or Northmen, during the eighth and ninth centuries, to which calamities we refer, we shall come to speak in a following chapter (chap. viii). We will here simply say that these hard experiences, and the infusion of the fresh blood of the northern peoples, resulted finally in the revival of the early vigor and martial spirit of the nation.

37. The Conversion of Germany. — The conversion of the tribes of Germany was effected by Celtic, Anglo-Saxon, and Frankish missionaries, — and the sword of Charles the Great. The great apostle of Germany was the Saxon Winfrid, better known as Saint Boniface, who was born about A.D. 688. During a long and intensely active life he founded schools and monasteries, organized churches, preached and baptized, and at last died a martyr's death (A.D. 753). Through him, as says Milman, the Saxon invasion of England flowed back upon the Continent.

A single incident will illustrate the zeal and resolution of the priest, and the character of his work in the German forests. Finding his followers still lingering in their old superstitions, Boniface resolved to demonstrate to them the powerlessness of their deities by felling a large venerable oak in a grove sacred to the Thunderer. The natives awaited with breathless expectation the issue of this challenge to their god, expecting to see the audacious priest struck to the earth by the bolts of heaven; but when the tree at last fell with a great crash, and no harm came to the bold axeman, the pagans acknowledged the superiority of the Christian God. Out of the wood of the sacred oak Boniface caused to be built a large chapel, and from this time the work of conversion went rapidly forward.

The Saxons were the most important of the German tribes *left untouched* by the mission of Boniface. (Only a small part

of this tribe, apparently, had pushed out to the conquest of England.) These fierce and obstinate pagans were finally driven within the pale of the Church by the hard blows of Charles the Great (par. 101).

The Christianizing of the tribes of Germany relieved the Teutonic folk of Western Europe from the constant peril of massacre by their heathen kinsmen, and erected a strong barrier in Central Europe against the advance of the waves of Turanian paganism and of Mohammedanism which for centuries beat so threateningly against the eastern frontiers of Germany.

38. The Conversion of Russia (988). — The Clovis of Russia was Vladimir the Great (d. 1015), a descendant of Rurik the Norseman (par. 115). This ruler, according to the account of the matter that has come down to us, having had urged upon his attention the claims of different religions, sent out envoys to make investigation respecting the relative merits of Mohammedanism, the Jewish religion, and Latin and Greek Christianity. The commissioners reported in favor of the religion of Constantinople, having been brought to this mind by what seemed to them the supernatural splendors of the ceremonials that they had witnessed in the great church of St. Sophia.

Vladimir caused the great wooden idol of the chief god of his people to be hurled into the Dnieper, and his subjects to be baptized in its waters by the Christian priests. This act of Vladimir marks the real beginning of the evangelization of Russia.

That the Slavic tribes should have come under the religious influence of Constantinople instead of under that of Rome, had far-reaching consequences for Russian history. First, it shut Russia out from all those civilizing influences that accompanied Latin Christianity, and thus caused her to lag in general culture far behind those countries of Western Europe that during mediæval times were under the tutelage of papal Rome (par. 34).

Again, through the choice that she made, Russia cut herself off from sympathy with the orthodox Catholic West, whence possibly she might have secured allies who would have helped her in turning back the tide of barbarian invasion which overwhelmed her in the twelfth century and retarded for many generations her national development (par. 377).

39. Christianity in the North. — The progress of Christianity in the North was slow; but gradually, during the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, the missionaries of the Church won over all the Scandinavian peoples.

The circumstances attending the introduction of the new religion into Iceland possess a special interest. In the year 1000 some missionaries from Norway pushed out to the island to aid a weak Christian party in establishing there the faith of the Cross. It so happened that just at this time one of the volcanoes of the land broke out in violent eruption. The advocates of the ancient faith, who bitterly opposed the new religion, declared that the outburst of lava was the sign of the anger of their gods because of the attempted innovation. But this argument was met by one of the old chiefs, who asked, "And what excited their wrath when these rocks of lava, which we ourselves tread, were themselves glowing torrents?"

The adherents of Odin[11] were silenced. A decree was ratified by the national assembly, which ordered that all the inhabitants be baptized, that the heathen idols and temples be destroyed, and that any one publicly worshiping the ancient deities be punished.

One important effect of the conversion of the Scandinavian nations was the checking of their piratical expeditions, which, during all the centuries of their pagan history, were constantly putting out from the fiords of the northern peninsulas and vexing every shore to the south.

By the year 1000 all Europe was claimed by Christianity,

[11] A deity corresponding to Woden, the chief god of the German tribes.

save the regions of the Northwest about the Baltic, which were inhabited chiefly by the still pagan Finns and Lapps; parts of what is now Russia, and the larger portion of the Iberian peninsula, which was in the hands of the Mohammedan Moors.

40. Reaction of Paganism on Christianity. — Thus were the conquerors of the empire met and conquered by Christianity. The victory, it must be confessed, was in a great degree a victory rather in name than in fact. The Church could not all at once leaven the great mass of heathenism which had so suddenly been brought within its pale. For a long time after they were called Christians, the barbarians, coarse and cruel and self-willed and superstitious as they were, understood very little of the doctrines and exhibited still less of the true spirit of the religion they professed. As Church says, "The immediate effect of this contact of the barbarians with Christianity was to lower and injure Christianity; Christianity raised them, but it suffered itself in the effort."

To this depressing reaction of Teutonic barbarism upon the Church is without doubt to be attributed in large measure the deplorable moral state of Europe during so great a portion of the mediæval ages.

41. Conclusion. — With a single word or two respecting the general consequences of the conversion to Christianity of the Teutonic tribes, we shall close the present chapter.

First, the timely conversion of the greater part of the conquerors of Rome, as has already been observed (par. 25), helped to save the civilization of antiquity from total destruction at their hands. The barbarians might, after their custom, sack a city or slaughter the inhabitants of a province, but because they were themselves Christians, they paused at the threshold of the cathedral or at the gate of the monastery.

Again, the adoption of the Christian faith by the barbarians set in the midst of the seething, martial nations of Europe an influence that fostered the gentler virtues, and an authority

that was always to be found on the side of social order and personal discipline.

Still again, the conversion of the barbarians prepared the way for the introduction among them of the arts and the culture of Rome, and contributed powerfully to hasten the fusion into a single people of the Latins and the Teutons, of which important matter we shall treat in a following chapter (chap. iv).

Furthermore, in teaching the brotherhood of man, the infinite value of every human soul, the essential equality in the sight of God of the high and the low, Christianity created in the new-forming race a new social conscience, which was one of the most potent forces concerned in the emancipation of the slave and the serf.

Finally, the adoption of a common faith by all the European peoples drew them together into a sort of religious brotherhood, and rendered it possible for them during the succeeding centuries, notwithstanding their minor differences in creed and ritual, to act in something like an effective concert in efforts to stay the threatening progress toward the West of the colossal Mohammedan power of the East. If during the Middle Ages the folks particularly of Western Europe had not thus been bound together by a common creed, it is quite possible that the Asiatic Moslems would have overrun the Continent and have made Europe an extension of Asia.

Sources and Source Material. — BEDE, *Ecclesiastical History* (Bohn). See above, par. 35, n. 10. Read bk. i, chaps. xxiii–xxv; bk. ii, chaps. i and xiii; bk. iii, chaps. iii and xxv. *Beowulf* (trans. by Garnett). See above, par. 35. Colby's *Selections*, Extract 6, "Saint Augustine, the Missionary," from Bæda's *Historia Ecclesiastica*. *Translations and Reprints* (Univ. of Penn.), vol. ii, No. 7, "Life of Saint Columban." An instructive and interesting biography of an Irish monk. The subject of this biography is sometimes named "Columba the Younger," to distinguish him from Saint Columba of Iona, mentioned above, par. 30. Mason's *The Mission of Augustine* contains all the narrative sources bearing on its special subject, with parallel English translations. Some

additional source material will be found in Kingsley's *The Hermits*, which is made up in part of translations of the lives of noted saints.

Secondary or Modern Works. — MILMAN (H. H.), *History of Latin Christianity*, vol. i, bk. iii, chap. ii, "Conversion of the Teutonic Races." MACLEAR (G. F.), *The Celts*, and MERIVALE (C.), *The Continental Teutons* (both in Conversion of the West series). ZIMMER (H.), ***The Irish Element in Mediæval Culture* (from the German). An authoritative and interesting account of the services rendered mediæval civilization by the Irish monks. ALZOG (J.), *Universal Church History* (Catholic, from the German), vol. ii, pp. 1–252. STANLEY (A. P.), **Christian Institutions*. Shows the influence of paganism upon the ceremonials, the ritual, usages, and various institutions of the Church. SCHAFF (P.), ***History of the Christian Church*, vol. iv, chap. ii, pp. 17–142, "The Conversion of the Northern and Western Barbarians." Excellent. KINGSLEY (C.), *The Hermits*. The life of Saint Severinus, the apostle of Noricum, has a special historical value. LINGARD (J.), **The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*. A book of first importance from the Catholic side.

CHAPTER III

MONASTICISM

42. Monasticism defined; the Ascetic Ideal in Different Religions. — It was during the period between the third and the sixth century that there grew up in the Church the institution known as Monasticism. This was so remarkable a system, and one that exerted so profound an influence upon mediæval and even later history, that we must here acquaint ourselves with at least its spirit and aims.

The term "monasticism," in its widest application,[1] denotes a life of austere self-denial, and of seclusion from the world, with the object of promoting the interests of the soul. As thus defined, the system embraced two prominent classes of ascetics: (1) Hermits, or anchorites, — persons who, retiring from the world, lived solitary lives in desolate places; (2) Cenobites, or monks, who formed communities, and lived usually under a common roof.

There was a difference, however, between the monasticism of the East and that of the West. The Oriental ascetics withdrew from the world primarily in order, through self-mortification, prayer, and contemplation, to make sure of their own salvation; while the monks of the West, although acting in a measure under a like motive, still were at the same time mindful of the needs of the world they had forsaken, and through many channels, as by prayer and teaching and missionary labors, strove to save others and to advance the general interests of the Church.

[1] Originally the term *monachus*, or "monk" (Greek μοναχος, from μονος, meaning alone), denoted a person living a solitary life; but later it came to be applied to one living in a community.

The ascetic idea of life was by no means original with Christianity. Brahmanism has always had its ascetics and hermits. All Buddhistic lands are to-day filled with monasteries and monks. About the time of Christ there were to be found in Syria among the Jews the Essenes, a sect of religious enthusiasts whose members affected a solitary and ascetic life.

43. Doctrines and Circumstances that fostered Christian Monasticism. — The germs of monasticism were imported into Christianity from the East. The Gnostics, an Oriental Christian sect, taught the doctrine of dualism; that is, that the material world is the creation and empire of an evil being, and is opposed to the world of spirit. This philosophy regards the body with all its appetites as evil, and places it in opposition to the indwelling soul. Hence the spirit must rule and subjugate the body. These Oriental doctrines were the germs out of which the ascetic system of Christendom seems to have developed.

The development was fostered by many influences, and particularly by the social and moral decadence that marked the civilization of the later Roman empire. Never, perhaps, was the moral and spiritual life of the ancient world at a lower ebb than at this time. Nor had the Church escaped the moral contagion. It had in a lamentable degree become conformed unto the world.

This state of things awakened a fierce protest in the souls of the more spiritually-minded, and created in them a longing for a higher ideal and a more strenuous religious life. Such persons naturally embraced with enthusiasm the ascetic life, which was in every respect in direct opposition to the prevailing conceptions and practices of society. In the face of unbridled licentiousness, the monks proclaimed the peculiar sanctity of the celibate life. In the face of covetousness and avarice, they preached the absolute worthlessness of all earthly possessions and exalted poverty into a virtue. To those

who were pampering their bodies in the luxurious baths, and making them effeminate and soft with perfumes and unguents, they, careless of the body, proclaimed the superiority of a clean soul. In opposition to the gluttony of the rich, the monks prescribed a diet of herbs and coarse bread; in the place of rich apparel, they clothed themselves in sackcloth and garments of hair. In this opposition of the ascetic ideal to the prevailing life and conduct of men, we see in what measure asceticism was a recoil from a social system which, denying the rightful supremacy of the soul over the body, marred the beauty and destroyed the dignity of life.

While the moral and social condition of the Græco-Roman world thus favored the development of the monastic system, certain Christian teachings drawn from various texts of the Bible tended in the same direction. Thus the Apostle Saint Paul had said: "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord; . . . but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world."[2] And Christ himself had declared: "If any man come to me and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brothers, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple";[3] and again, he had said to the rich young man: "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor."[4]

These passages, and others like them, were taken literally, and tended greatly to confirm the belief of the ascetic that his life of isolation and poverty and abstinence was the most perfect life and the surest way to salvation.

44. The Christian Ascetics of the East. — It was about the beginning of the third century when the enthusiasm for the ascetic life seized upon the Christians of the East like a contagion. The Decian persecution (A.D. 249–251), driving thousands into the deserts, contributed vastly to the movement. The famous Saint Antony, an Egyptian ascetic (born about

[2] I Cor. vii, 32, 33. [3] Luke xiv, 26. [4] Matt. xix, 21.

A.D. 251), who by his example and influence gave a tremendous impulse to the strange enthusiasm, is called the "father of the hermits." The romance of his life, written by the celebrated Athanasius, stirred the whole Christian world and led thousands to renounce society and in imitation of the saint to flee to the desert. It is estimated that before the close of the fourth century the population of the desert in many districts in Egypt was equal to that of the cities.

Most renowned of all the anchorites of the East was Saint Simeon Stylites, the Saint of the Pillar (died A.D. 459), who spent thirty-six years on a column only three feet in diameter at the top, which he had gradually raised to a height of over fifty feet. His austerities earned for him the title of "the Star of the Earth and the Wonder of the World." [5]

45. Monasticism in the West. — During the fourth century the anchoretic type of asceticism, which was favored by the mild climate of the Eastern lands and especially by that of Egypt, assumed in some degree the monastic form; that is to say, the fame of this or that anchorite or hermit drew about him a number of disciples whose rude huts or cells formed what was known as a *laura*, the nucleus of a monastery.

Soon after the cenobite system had been established in the East it was introduced into Europe, and in an astonishingly short space of time spread throughout all the Western countries where Christianity had gained a foothold. Here it prevailed to the almost total exclusion of the hermit mode of life, though there were some famous anchorites among the European churches; but the climate and the love of activity that characterizes the Western races were unfavorable to the development of the enthusiasm in this form. Monasteries arose on every side. The number that fled to these retreats was vastly augmented by the disorder and terror attending the invasion of the barbarians and the overthrow of the Empire in the West. The movement drew within the circle of its influence women

[5] Read Tennyson's poem, "Saint Simeon Stylites."

as well as men, and nunneries were founded in great numbers, which were subjected to a discipline similar to that of the monasteries.

46. The Rule of Saint Benedict. — With the view to introducing some sort of regularity into the practices and austerities of the monks, rules were early prescribed for their observance. The three essential requirements or vows of the monk were poverty, chastity, and obedience. Saint Pachomius, an Egyptian ascetic of the fourth century, is said to have been the first to make rules for the regulation of the lives of the monks who gathered about him.

But the greatest legislator of the monks was Saint Benedict of Nursia (A.D. 480–543), the founder of the celebrated monastery of Monte Cassino, situated midway between Rome and Naples in Italy. His code was to the religious world what the *Corpus Juris Civilis* of Justinian (par. 65) was to the lay society of Europe. Many of the rules of his system were most wise and practical, as, for instance, one that made manual work a pious duty, and another that required the monk to spend an allotted time each day in sacred reading.

The monks who subjected themselves to the rule of Saint Benedict were known as Benedictines. The order became immensely popular, and so almost universal that Charles the Great is said to have been obliged to make diligent inquiry to ascertain whether there were monks of any other order. At one time it embraced about forty thousand abbeys. From its ranks came twenty-four popes, and bishops and saints without number.

47. Monastic Reforms; the New Orders. — Monasticism as an active and potent force in the history of the West has a long and wonderful history of more than a thousand years. This history presents one dominant fact, — ever-renewed reform movements in the monasteries. Scarcely was a monastery or a monastic order established before the acquisition of wealth brought in idleness, self-indulgence, and laxity of discipline.

But there was always among the backsliding dwellers in the cloisters a "saving remnant," and upon these choice souls the spirit of reform was sure to descend, and thus it happens that with the reform movements marking the history of the monks are associated the names of many of the most spiritually-minded and exalted characters produced by the mediæval ages. No other cause of humanity has enlisted more capacity, zeal, and heroic self-devotion than that of the renovation of the degenerate monastic orders.

Among the earliest and most noteworthy of these reform movements was that which resulted in the founding in the year 910 of the celebrated monastery of Cluny in Burgundy. The influences which radiated out from the cloisters of Cluny left a deep impression upon more than two centuries of history (pars. 179, 187).

Towards the close of the eleventh century were established the Carthusian and Cistercian Orders, and in the thirteenth century those of the Franciscans and Dominicans. Respecting the last two we shall have something to say in connection with the history of the times in which they arose (par. 233).

48. **Services rendered by the Monks to Civilization.** — The early establishment of the monastic system in the Church resulted in great advantages to the new world that was shaping itself out of the ruins of the old. The monks, especially the Benedictines, became agriculturists, and by patient labor converted the wild and marshy lands which they received as gifts from princes and others into fruitful fields, thus redeeming from barrenness some of the most desolate districts of Europe. The monks, in a word, formed the vanguard of civilization towards the wilderness. "As formerly," says Prevost-Paradol, "the Roman colony went out from the capital in order to confirm the subjugation of the conquered, and to spread about itself the manners and laws of the great republic, so do we see, in this new conquest of Europe,

monasteries establish themselves in the footsteps of the Christian armies, or of the missionaries of the Church, and constantly push out in every direction, by the clearing away of the forests and the preaching of the Gospel, the material and moral boundaries of the civilized world." [6]

The monks also became missionaries, and it was largely to their zeal and devotion that the Church owed her speedy and signal victory over the barbarians. It is about the names of such devoted monks as saints Columba, Gallus, and Boniface that gathers much of the romance of the missions of the mediæval Church.

The quiet air of the monasteries nourished learning as well as piety. The monks became teachers, and under the shelter of the monasteries established schools which were the nurseries of learning during the earlier Middle Ages and the centers for centuries of the best intellectual life of Europe. These monastic schools held that place in society which later was filled by the universities.

The monks also became copyists, and with great painstaking and industry gathered and multiplied ancient manuscripts, and thus preserved and transmitted to the modern world much classical learning and literature that would otherwise have been lost. Almost all the remains of the Greek and Latin classics that we possess have come to us through the agency of the monks.

The monks also became the chroniclers of the events of their own times, so that it is to them we are indebted for a great part of our knowledge of the early mediæval centuries.[7] Thus the scriptorium, or writing-room of the monastery, held the place in mediæval society that the great publishing house holds in the modern world.

[6] *Essai sur l'Histoire Universelle*, tome ii, p. 64.

[7] Cassiodorus (par. 16) seems to have been the first to introduce intellectual *labor into the* routine of the cloistral life. He at all events gave a great impulse *to the work of the* scriptorium.

The monks became further the almoners of the pious and the wealthy, and distributed alms to the poor and needy. Everywhere the monasteries opened their hospitable doors to the weary, the sick, and the discouraged. In a word, these retreats were the inns, the asylums, and the hospitals of the mediæval ages. This spirit of helpfulness and charity found its embodiment in the women who became nuns. To a woman is to be attributed the establishment of the first Christian hospital.[8]

Again, the asceticism of the monks did much to correct those gross social vices that had sapped the strength of the Greek and Roman races, and threw a needed safeguard about the young and strong-passioned race of the North that was entering upon the inheritance of antiquity. It was undoubtedly in this its vehement protest against the immorality of the decadent society of the Græco-Roman world that the monastic Church rendered its greatest service to civilization.

49. Evil Outgrowths of the System. — No institution has ever been set up among men that in its practical workings has not produced evils which must be set off against the good it has wrought for humanity. These evils arise either from defects inherent in the institution itself or from a disregard of its spirit or a perversion of its principles.

In the case of monasticism there is a wide divergence of opinion in respect to the influence and tendency of several of its underlying principles or requirements, as, for instance, those of celibacy and poverty, and withdrawal from the secular concerns of the world. But this difference of judgment does not extend to the consequences to mediæval society that resulted from the perversion of the monastic

[8] "A Roman lady, named Fabiola, in the fourth century founded at Rome, as an act of penance, the first public hospital, and the charity planted by that woman's hand overspread the world, and will alleviate, to the end of time, the darkest anguish of humanity." — LECKY, *History of European Morals*, vol. ii, p. 80; *quoted by Wishart, Monks and Monasteries*, p. 105.

ideal, or from the neglect on the part of the individual monks of their vows, and disregard of the rules of their order.

The vow of personal poverty of the monks was in large measure made of no effect by the wealth which they came to possess as communities or orders. As we have seen, with riches came their usual attendant evils, — idleness, luxury in buildings and in living, and an evasion of the severe discipline of monastic rules.

A still more prolific source of evil was the flagrant disregard by many monks of their vow of chastity. At certain times and in certain monasteries the condition of things within the cloisters was so shameful that every stream of influence issuing from these places, which should have been fountain-heads only of sweet and wholesome influences, was corrupt and contaminating.

These evils, in spite of the ever-renewed efforts for reform that were made within the ranks of the monks themselves, became more and more flagrant and seemingly incurable as the centuries passed, and finally, in connection with other causes, brought the entire monastic system in such disrepute that in many of the countries of Europe it became possible for the enemies of the monks to drive them from their cloisters and to confiscate to secular uses the vast wealth with which their houses had been endowed during the centuries of their beneficent services in the cause of piety, morality, and social order.

Sources and Source Material. — Henderson's *Select Documents of the Middle Ages*, pp. 274–314, "The Rule of Saint Benedict." *European History Studies* (Univ. of Nebraska), vol. ii, No. 6, "Monasticism." *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Second Series), vol. iv, for "Life of Saint Antony," by Athanasius; vol. vi, for "Life of Paulus" and "Life of Saint Hilarion," by Saint Jerome; vol. xi, for the "Institutes" and the "Conferences" of Cassian, and the "Life of Saint Martin" and the "Dialogues" of Sulpicius Severus. The "Institutes," the "Conferences," and the "Dialogues" extol the virtues of the most famous of the hermits and monks and instruct the reader respecting the customs

and rules of the monasteries. In this same series, and also in the Bohn Library, will be found the writings of the contemporary church historians, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius. The works of these Fathers are an inexhaustible mine of material for the illustration of early monasticism. Kingsley's *The Hermits*, as we have already noticed, contains much valuable source material. Athanasius's "Life of Saint Antony" can be found here in literal translation.

Secondary or Modern Works. — MONTALEMBERT (COUNT DE), ** *The Monks of the West from Saint Benedict to Saint Bernard*, 7 vols. An ardent eulogy of monasticism. LECKY (W. E. H.), *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne*, vol. ii, chap. iv. Gives the light and the shade of the picture. MAITLAND (S. R.), *The Dark Ages* (3d ed., London, 1853), Essay No. 10, on monasticism in general; and No. 24, on the monastic *scriptoria*. WISHART (A. W.), ** *A Short History of Monks and Monasteries*. The best short account in English of the origin, ideals, and effects of the monastic system. PUTNAM (G. H.), *Books and their Makers during the Middle Ages*, vol. i. For the labors of the monks as copyists and illuminators. KINGSLEY (C.), *The Hermits* (various editions). Very interesting. SCHAFF (P.),** *History of the Christian Church* (5th ed.), chap. iv, pp. 147–233, "The Rise and Progress of Monasticism." A masterly sketch. JESSOPP (A.), *The Coming of the Friars*, chap. iii, "Daily Life in a Mediæval Monastery." CUTTS (E. L.), *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1885), pp. 93–156, "Hermits and Recluses." BUTLER (A.), *Lives of the Saints* (full title, *The Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and Other Principal Saints*), 2 vols., London, 1833. This is a republication of the original 12-vol. edition. Butler died in 1773. His great work is a compilation from a multitude of different sources. For consultation and reference.

CHAPTER IV

FUSION OF THE LATIN AND TEUTONIC PEOPLES

50. Introductory. — Having seen how the Hebrew element, that is, the ideas, beliefs, and sentiments of Christianity, became the common possession of the Latins and Teutons, it yet remains to notice how these two races, upon the soil of the old empire, intermingled their blood, their languages, their laws, their usages and customs, to form new peoples, new tongues, and new institutions.

In the new society arising from the fusion of the Latinized inhabitants of the empire and their barbarian conquerors, the various resulting social or political institutions exhibit very different proportions of the two combining elements. Sometimes it is the Latin, and then again the Teutonic element which predominates. Often, indeed, it is very difficult, as in the case of Feudalism (par. 143), to determine just what was contributed by each. In many institutions we shall find the shaping spirit to have come from the classic culture, and the form from barbarian maxims and usages; then, again, we shall discover the spirit to be Teutonic and the form Roman.

In the present chapter we shall speak of only a few things touching the intermingling of the peoples themselves, the formation of the new Romance tongues, and the relation of the barbarian codes to the Roman law. We shall say just enough to show how composite is the character of the structure that was reared on the site of the ancient empire, out of the ruins of the broken-down civilization of Rome and the new contributions of the northern peoples.

51. The Barbarians and the Roman Lands. — The Teutons in their different settlements dealt with the conquered inhabitants of the empire with varying degrees of harshness, the treatment in any particular case being determined by the character of the intruding tribe and the circumstances attending the invasion. Usually, cattle, furniture, money, the treasures of the churches, — all movables, in a word, were at once appropriated by the barbarians as the legitimate spoils of war. But as a general thing they left the conquered provincials their freedom, and supplied themselves with servants by forcing the subjected people to give up to them part or all of their slaves. Yet, as a punishment for revolt or obstinate resistance, the entire population of a city or of a province was sometimes reduced to slavery, or was exterminated.

If the intruders proposed to make a permanent settlement, they took possession of such portion of the soil as their numbers required. The German tribes that invaded Gaul in the time of Julius Cæsar were accustomed to demand of the conquered Celts one-half of their lands. The German adherents of Odovacar demanded and received one-third of the soil of Italy;[1] the Ostrogoths seized two-thirds of the lands of the same country; and the Visigoths took possession of a like proportion of the regions they occupied; the Vandals appropriated the most and the best of the lands of North Africa; while the Saxons stripped the subjugated inhabitants of Britain of everything, indeed reduced them to serfdom, or pushed them entirely off the soil. Where the conquered people were left any portion of their ancient possessions, this usually was the tillable part of the land, the barbarians, being essentially hunters and shepherds, choosing for their part the forests and

[1] In this case "the proportion claimed was, no doubt, suggested by the imperial system of billeting, according to which the citizen upon whom a soldier was quartered was bound to divide his house into three compartments, of which he kept one himself, his unbidden guest was then entitled to select another, and the third portion as well as the first remained in the occupation of the owner." — HODGKIN.

pastures. The Burgundians, however, took two-thirds of the arable land of the districts they settled, the forest and pasture land being used in common by the invaders and the provincials.

52. The Romance Nations. — In some districts the barbarian invaders and the Roman provincials were kept apart for a long time by the bitter antagonism of race, and by a sense of injury on the one hand and a feeling of disdainful superiority on the other. But for the most part the Teutonic intruders and the Latin-speaking inhabitants of Italy, Spain, and France very soon began freely to mingle their blood by family alliances.

It is quite impossible to say what proportion the Teutons bore to the Romans. Of course the proportion varied in the different countries. In none of the countries named, however, was it large enough to absorb the Latinized population; on the contrary, the barbarians were themselves absorbed, yet not without changing very essentially the body into which they were incorporated. Thus about the end of the fourth century everything in Italy, Spain, and France — dwellings, cities, dress, customs, language, laws, soldiers — reminds us of Rome. A little later and a great change has taken place. The barbarians have come in. For a time we see everywhere, jostling each other in the streets and markets, crowding each other in the theaters and courts, kneeling together in the churches, the former Romanized subjects of the empire and their uncouth Teutonic conquerors. But by the close of the ninth century the two elements have become quite intimately blended, and a century or two later Roman and Teuton have alike disappeared, and we are introduced to Italians, Spaniards, and Frenchmen. These we call Romance nations, because at base they are Roman.[2]

[2] Britain did not become a Romance nation on account of the nature of the barbarian conquest of that island. As we have seen (par. 22), the Romanized Celts of the eastern half of Britain were mostly destroyed or driven out by the fierce Germanic invaders, so that these intruders remained substantially unmixed *till their tongue and their* law had established themselves in the island. Hence

53. The Formation of the Romance Languages. — During the five centuries of their subjection to Rome, the natives of Spain and Gaul forgot their barbarous dialects and came to speak a corrupt Latin. This exchange of languages was of course effected very gradually. Midway in the period, that is to say about the third century after Christ, it was almost a necessity for persons who dealt with all classes of society to be familiar with both the Latin and the Celtic language; but by the fifth century the native tongue had everywhere and almost wholly given way to the speech of the conquerors.

Now in exactly the same way that the barbarous dialects of the Celtic tribes of Gaul and of the Celtiberians of Spain had given way to the more refined speech of the Romans, did the rude languages of the Teutons now yield to the more cultured speech of the Roman provincials. In the course of two or three centuries after their entrance into the empire, Goths, Lombards, Burgundians, and Franks had, in a large measure, dropped their own tongue, and were speaking that of the people they had subjected. The conqueror became the conquered. "Rome, which had Latinized her conquered provinces, ultimately Latinized also her German conquerors."

But there is need we bear in mind that the Latin used by the Roman provincials was not the classic speech of the capital. In its adoption by rude and ignorant peoples, the Latin had necessarily suffered change and degradation. It was this vulgar Latin that now underwent a still further corruption upon the lips of the mixed descendants of the Romans and Teutons. These semi-barbarians, children that they were, had the same dislike for the difficult declensions and conjugations of the Latin that many young pupils entertain to-day; and so in place of the long and troublesome

the resemblance in manners, social arrangements, and language between the English and the modern Germans. The English would still more resemble the Germans of to-day, were it not for the accident of the Norman Conquest, which, in the eleventh century, mingled the speech and the customs of Normandy with the speech *and the customs of* England (par. 167).

terminations of the nouns and verbs, they substituted particles and auxiliary verbs. Long words they shortened by dropping out syllables, with a view to rendering them easier to pronounce.

These changes were hastened and rendered greater than they would otherwise have been, by the decay of literature and learning; for nothing so conserves the forms of a language as its embalmment in literature. This fixes and makes permanent the forms of words, which in the swift stream of illiterate speech are worn and rounded like pebbles in a mountain torrent.

Furthermore, because of the absence of a common popular literature, the changes that took place in one country did not exactly correspond to those going on in another. Hence, in the course of time, we find different dialects springing up, and by about the ninth century the Latin has virtually disappeared as a spoken language, and its place been usurped by what will be known as the Italian, the Spanish, the Portuguese, the French, and the Provençal tongues, all more or less resembling the ancient Latin, and all called Romance languages, because children of the old Roman speech.

54. Consequences of the Confusion of Languages. — We are now in position to discern one of the causes that helped to render denser that dark pall of ignorance which, settling over Western Europe in the fifth century, continued almost unrelieved until the eleventh.

As the provincial Latin began to change, the language in which the books were written and the speech of common talk began to diverge. Thus the manuscript rolls which held the wisdom of the Greeks and Romans soon became sealed to all save the learned. In this way the confusion of tongues conspired with the general confusion and anarchy of the times to extinguish the last rays of science and philosophy, and to deepen the gloom of the night that had settled upon all the lands once illumined by ancient learning and culture. Several

centuries had necessarily to pass before the new languages forming could develop each a literature of its own (par. 281). Meanwhile all learning was shut up within the walls of the monasteries.

55. The Barbarians and Roman Learning. — The sentiments of the barbarians tended to the same end as the separation of the language of everyday use from that of letters. They prided themselves on their ignorance of letters, deeming that these impaired the native vigor of the mind, and rendered soft and effeminate the becoming hardihood of the warrior. The subjected Roman provincials unfortunately came to entertain the same opinion. With no rewards for learning, no praises of society for the successful cultivator of letters, both naturally fell into contempt and neglect. "For many centuries," says Hallam, "to sum up the account of ignorance in a word, it was rare for a layman, of whatever rank, to know how to sign his name." Charles the Great, king of the Franks, the most renowned personage of the five centuries immediately following the fall of Rome, was unable to write (par. 103).

56. The Barbarian Codes. — The Teutonic tribes, before they entered the Roman empire, had no written laws. As soon as settled in the provinces, however, they began, in imitation of the Romans, to frame their rules and customs into codes, and so we hear of the Salian, the Ripuarian, the Burgundian, the Lombard, and the Visigothic code.

In some countries, particularly in Spain and Italy, this work was under the supervision of the clergy, and hence the codes of the Teutonic peoples in these countries was a sort of fusion of Roman principles and barbarian practices. But in general these early compilations of laws — they were made, for the most part, between the sixth and ninth centuries — were not so essentially modified by Latin influence but that they serve as valuable and instructive memorials of the customs, ideals, and social arrangements of the Teutonic peoples.

57. The Personal Character of the Teutonic Laws. — The laws of the barbarians, so long as they remained such, that is to say, until Latins and Teutons became one people, were generally personal, instead of territorial as with us; that is, instead of all the inhabitants of a given country being subject to the same laws, there were different ones for the different classes of society. The Latins, for instance, were subject in private law[3] only to the old Roman code, while the Teutons lived under the tribal rules and regulations which they had brought with them from beyond the Rhine and the Danube. The curious state of things resulting from this personality of law, as it is called, is vividly pictured by the following observation of a chronicler: "For it would often happen," he says, "that five men would be sitting or walking together, not one of whom would have the same law with any other."

Even among themselves the Teutons knew nothing of the modern legal maxim that all should stand equal before the law. The penalty inflicted upon the evil-doer depended, not upon the nature of his crime, but upon his rank, or that of the party injured. Thus slaves and serfs could be beaten and put to death for minor offenses, while a freeman might atone for any crime, even for murder, by the payment of a fine, the amount of the penalty being determined by the rank of the victim. Among the Franks, the *weregild*, or "man-money," as the compensation for murder was called, was fixed by the "tariff of damages" at six hundred solidi (the solidus was equal to about thirty or forty francs of the money of to-day) for the life of a vassal of the king, but at only one-third this sum for the life of a common Frank. Among the Saxons the life of a king's thane was worth twelve hundred shillings, while that of a churl was valued only one-sixth as high.[4]

The satisfaction allowed to despised classes of persons for assault or insult was sometimes singularly whimsical. Thus

[3] All were alike subject to the same public or political law.

[4] *Hallam's Middle Ages*, "Weregild."

mountebanks and jugglers were simply given the satisfaction of striking the shadow of their assailant; while the injured hired champion (par. 58) — a person held in especially low esteem — was to consider ample reparation to have been made him when the offender cast upon him a ray of sunshine reflected from a polished shield.[5]

58. Ordeals. — Among primitive peoples, before public authority is strong enough to undertake the punishment of crime, every man is the avenger of his own wrongs. Gradually, however, all this is changed, and society undertakes to punish wrong-doing. Now the German tribes at the time to which we have brought our narrative had, speaking generally, made this transition. This is evidenced not only by the establishment for certain crimes of fixed penalties, such as we have noticed in the preceding paragraph, but further by the existence among them of institutions to ascertain the guilt or the innocence of accused persons. But the agencies relied upon for this purpose show in how rude a state the administration of justice among them was. One very common method of proof was by what were called ordeals, in which the question was submitted to the judgment of God. Of these the chief were the *ordeal by fire*, the *ordeal by water*, and the *wager of battle*.[6]

The *ordeal by fire* consisted in taking in the hand a piece of red-hot iron, or in walking blindfolded with bare feet over a row of hot ploughshares laid lengthwise at irregular distances. If the person escaped unharmed, his innocence was held to be established.

Another way of performing the fire-ordeal was by running through the flames of two fires built close together, or by walking over live brands; hence the phrase "to haul over the

[5] Lea's *Superstition and Force* (4th ed., 1892), p. 188.

[6] The wager of battle is by some writers treated as a distinct form of trial; but being an appeal to the decision of Heaven, it rested on the same principle as the trials by fire and water, and consequently is properly given a place among the ordeals.

coals." It was in this way that the first crusaders in the eleventh century tried a priest who was accused of deceit (par. 199); and just at the close of the fifteenth century the celebrated Savonarola, in Italy, consented to allow a companion monk to walk through the flames to settle a dispute relating to certain claims made by the reformer. In this latter case, however, some difficulties in arranging the preliminaries of the ordeal, and a sudden dash of rain, which put out the fire, prevented the trial.

The *ordeal by water* was of two kinds, by hot water and by cold. In the hot-water ordeal the accused person thrust his arm into boiling water, and if no hurt was visible upon the arm three days after the operation, the party was considered guiltless. When we speak of one's being "in hot water," we use an expression which had its origin in this ordeal.

In the cold-water trial the suspected person was thrown into a stream or pond: if he floated, he was held guilty; if he sank, innocent. The water, it was believed, would reject the guilty, but receive the innocent into its bosom. The practice common in Europe until a very recent date of trying supposed witches by throwing them into a pond of water to see whether they would sink or float, grew out of this superstition.[7]

The *trial by combat*, or the *wager of battle*, as it was called, was simply a judicial duel. This form of trial was seemingly introduced into jurisprudence as a regulation of the right of private war, or as a limitation by law and rule of the barbarian's primitive right to avenge his own wrongs. In the course of time there became attached to it the idea that God would intervene to defend the right, and then it became in principle

[7] There was a difference, however, between the old ordeal and the later trial, which was strictly not an ordeal at all, it being no longer an appeal to the decision of God, but merely a test as to change in specific gravity, the superstition now consisting in the belief that the body of a witch became, through communication with evil spirits, imponderable like them, and thus capable of being spirited *through the air.*

altogether like the other ordeals — an appeal to the judgment of Heaven.

One circumstance that caused this form of the ordeal to be often invoked was the misuse of the kind of trial known as compurgation, or the *wager of law*.[8] This allowed a person accused of a crime to clear himself by simply swearing that he was innocent, provided he could get a sufficient number of his relatives or neighbors to swear that he was telling the truth.[9] The number of concurring witnesses was dependent upon the seriousness of the charge or the rank of the person making the oath. Now this privilege was liable to abuse, and the only resort left to the injured person in such case was to challenge the perjurer to submit to the judgment of God as it should be pronounced in a solemn judicial combat.

This form of trial grew into great favor. Even the judge in some cases resorted to it to maintain the authority and dignity of his court. To a person who had disregarded a summons the judge would send a challenge in this form: "I sent for thee, and thou didst not think it worth thy while to come; I demand therefore satisfaction for this thy contempt." Religious disputes also were sometimes settled by this sort of "martial logic." In Spain as late as the eleventh century a contention as to which of two liturgies should be adopted was decided by a combat between two knights.

The ordeal was frequently performed by deputy, that is, one person for hire or for the sake of friendship would undertake it for another; hence the expression "to go through fire and water to serve one." Especially was such substitution common in the judicial duel, as women and ecclesiastics were generally forbidden to appear personally in the lists. There are instances mentioned, however, where even women performed

[8] The wager of law is not to be reckoned among the ordeals, as it lacked the essential element of an ordeal, namely, the appeal to the judgment of Heaven.

[9] In course of time this form of the oath was changed, so that the compurgators, as the witnesses were called, simply swore that they *believed* the oath of the accused *to be true and clean.*

the wager of battle; in which case, to equalize the conditions, the man was placed in a pit waist-deep, with his left hand tied behind his back.

The champions, as the deputies were called, became in time a regular class in society, like the gladiators in ancient Rome. Religious houses and chartered towns hired champions at a regular salary to defend all the cases to which they might become a party. In order that the champion might be stimulated to do his best for the party he represented, he was hanged or suffered the loss of a hand or a foot if he allowed himself to be worsted in a combat.[10]

In the management of the ordeals fraud and collusion were often practiced. It was not very difficult for those conducting them to carry through the ordeal without harm the person whose innocence they were interested in establishing. Doubtless they sometimes employed the devices and tricks used by the mountebank or sleight-of-hand performer at the present day, which enable him, unhurt, to handle fire, and to do other things equally marvelous in the eyes of the ignorant.

59. The Revival of the Roman Law. — Now these codes of the barbarians, the character of which we have simply suggested by the preceding illustrations, gradually displaced

[10] There were many other forms of the ordeal, besides those we have given, in use among the different Teutonic tribes, some of which were plainly native customs, while others seem to have been introduced by the Christian priests. Thus, there was the ordeal by consecrated bread; if the morsel strangled the person, he was adjudged guilty. From this form of trial arose the expression, "May this morsel be my last." In what was called the ordeal of the bier the person charged with murder was made to touch the body of the dead man; if the body stirred or blood flowed afresh from the wound, the man was held guilty of the murder.

Such ordeals are found among all barbarous and superstitious people. The Hindus had many curious ones. In one the person accused of a crime was forced to swim across a river filled with crocodiles; if caught by the reptiles, that was conclusive proof of his guilt. Proof by ordeal was also known among the Hebrews; see Numbers v, 11–31; Joshua vii, 16–18. The combat between David and Goliath, being an appeal to the judgment of Heaven, possesses the essential element of the judicial duel. We also find an ordeal in the test proposed by Elijah to the prophets of Baal, — I Kings xviii, 17–40.

the Roman law in all those countries where the two systems at first existed alongside each other, save in Italy and Southern France, where the great preponderance of the Latin population, in connection with other circumstances, caused the barbarian laws gradually to give way to the Roman. But, after a while, as a deeper darkness settled over Europe, these written laws of the barbarians also fell into disuse. The spirit and principles, however, of these early collections animated and shaped the new customs and usages which grew up to meet the changing needs of society. That is to say, speaking generally, the customs and practices that had force in a great part of Europe during the earlier mediæval centuries were Teutonic rather than Roman.

But this supremacy of the maxims and customs of the barbarians over the law system of the Romans was destined not to be permanent. The admirable jurisprudence of Rome was bound to assert its superiority. Thus about the close of the eleventh century there was a great revival in the study of the Roman law, and in the course of a century or two this became either the groundwork or a strong modifying element in the jurisprudence of almost all the peoples of Europe.

What took place may be illustrated by reference to the fate of the Teutonic languages in Gaul, Italy, and Spain. As the barbarian tongues, after maintaining a place in those countries for two or three centuries, at length gave place to the superior Latin, which became the basis of the new Romance languages, so now in the domain of law the barbarian maxims and customs, though holding their place more persistently, likewise finally give way, almost everywhere and in a greater or less degree, to the more excellent law system of the empire. Rome must fulfill her destiny and give laws to the nations.

Though longer delayed in their adoption, the law maxims and principles of the empire at length became more widely spread and influential than the Latin speech; for Germany, which never gave up her Teutonic tongue, finally adopted

the Roman law system, to the degree of making its principles the basis of her jurisprudence. And even England, though she clung tenaciously to her Teutonic customs and maxims, just as she held on to her own Teutonic speech, could not escape the influence of the Roman jurisprudence, which penetrated there, and, to a certain extent, chiefly through the courts of the Church, modified English law, just as the Latin in an indirect way finally modified and enriched the English speech, while leaving it the same in groundwork and structure. "Our laws," says Lord Bacon, "are mixed as our language; and as our language is so much the richer, the laws are the more complete."

Under the influence of the classical revival, the various ordeals, which were already disappearing before the growing enlightenment of the age and the steady opposition of the papal authority, rapidly gave way to modes of trial more consonant with reason and the spirit of the civil law.

Sources and Source Material. — Henderson's *Select Historical Documents*, pp. 176–189, "The Salic Law," and pp. 314–319, "'*Formulæ Liturgicæ*' in use at Ordeals." Lee's *Source-Book of English History*, chap. v, "Anglo-Saxon Laws." *Translations and Reprints* (Univ. of Penn.), vol. iv, No. 4, "Ordeals," etc.

Secondary or Modern Works. — EMERTON (E.), ** *Introduction to the Middle Ages*, chap. viii, "Germanic Ideas of Law." LEA (H. C.), ** *Superstition and Force: Essays on the Wager of Law, the Wager of Battle, the Ordeal and Torture* (4th ed., 1892). Invaluable to the student of primitive culture. GUIZOT (F. P. G.), *History of Civilization in France*, vol. i, lects. viii–xi. This important work forms vols. ii–iv, of the Appleton edition of the author's "History of Civilization in Europe," 1 vol., and "History of Civilization in France," 3 vols. HALLAM (H.), *View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages* (revised ed.; various issues), chap. ix, first part. Although the first edition of this work appeared in 1818, it is still of value. SOHM (R.), *The Institutes of Roman Law* (trans. by James C. Leddie: 2d ed., 1901), sect. 1, "The Reception of the Roman Law in Germany"; sects. 23–28, "The Subsequent Fate of Roman Law." HADLEY (J.), *Introduction to Roman Law*, lect. ii, "The Roman Law since Justinian."

CHAPTER V

THE ROMAN EMPIRE IN THE EAST

60. The Era of Justinian (A.D. 527–565). — During the fifty years immediately following the fall of Rome, the Eastern emperors struggled hard and sometimes doubtfully to withstand the waves of the barbarian inundation which constantly threatened to overwhelm Constantinople with the same awful calamities that had befallen the imperial city of the West. Had the New Rome — the destined refuge for a thousand years of Græco-Roman learning and culture — also gone down at this time before the storm, the loss to the cause of civilization would have been incalculable.

Fortunately, in the year 527, there ascended the Eastern throne a prince of unusual ability, to whom fortune gave a general of such rare genius that his name has been allotted a place in the short list of the great commanders of the world. Justinian was the name of the prince, and Belisarius that of the soldier. The sovereign has given name to the period, which is called after him the "Era of Justinian."

We shall first notice, very briefly, the wars of Justinian, — the management of which was intrusted, for the most part, to his famous general, Belisarius; afterwards we shall say something of his works of peace, which, far more than the conquests of his arms, entitle the prince to our praise and admiration.

61. The Recovery of Africa (A.D. 533). — Ambition and religious motives united in urging Justinian to endeavor to wrest from the barbarians those provinces of the empire in the West upon which they had seized. It seemed to him

a reproach and disgrace that the sovereigns of the New Rome should appear unable to retain the territories won by the valor of the consuls and the Cæsars of the Old. He coveted for himself the honor of restoring to their ancient and most extended circuit the boundaries of the Roman empire.

To these natural promptings of pride and ambition were added the persuasions of religion. The barbarians who had taken possession of the Western provinces were, the most of them, as we have learned (par. 26), followers of Arius, whose doctrines were held to be heretical by the orthodox Catholics. But these semi-Christians were, nevertheless, zealous converts, and making up in zeal what they lacked in orthodoxy, became, some of them, and notably the Vandals, furious persecutors of the adherents of the Athanasian creed. A strong appeal was thus made to the piety of the emperor to deliver the true Catholic Church of the West out of the hands of the barbarian heretics.

The state of affairs in Africa invited the intervention of Justinian first in that quarter. Gelimer, a zealous and bigoted Arian, had just usurped the Vandal throne. Justinian sent an embassy to expostulate with the usurper and demand the restoration of the throne to the rightful prince. Gelimer replied to the imperial commissioners with that haughty insolence characteristic of his race. "King Gelimer," thus his answer ran, "wishes to point out to King Justinian that it is a good thing for rulers to mind their own business." Upon receiving this reply, Justinian resolved on war. But such was the terror of the Vandal name that the subjects of the emperor declaimed against such a distant and hazardous enterprise. For a moment Justinian wavered in his purpose. But a zealous ecclesiastic reanimated the hesitating resolution of the emperor by declaring that he had seen a vision in which God commanded that the war should be immediately *undertaken.*

The expedition was intrusted to the command of a general of Thracian birth — Belisarius. He was a man worthy of the confidence that his master reposed in his fidelity and genius. Already in four years' warfare upon the Persian frontier (A.D. 528–531) he had illustrated his rare qualities as a commander, although yet but a young man of twenty-six years.

With the general issue of the undertaking we have already become acquainted (par. 19). Belisarius returned to Constantinople with many Vandal prisoners and with a large booty, a part of which is said to have consisted of the sacred vessels, including the seven-branched candlestick, which Titus in the reign of Vespasian had taken from the Temple at Jerusalem, and which the Vandal Geiseric upon the sack of Rome in the year A.D. 453 had borne away with him to Carthage.[1] The emperor Justinian, fearing lest this sacred relic should bring upon his own capital the misfortunes which it was believed to have brought upon both Rome and Carthage, caused it to be returned to Jerusalem and deposited in the church of the Holy Sepulcher.

62. The Recovery of Italy (A.D. 535–553). — The subversion of the Vandal power in Africa was followed by the destruction of the Ostrogothic kingdom in Italy (par. 16). In the year 535 Belisarius disembarked his army, recruited by many Vandals who had enlisted under the standard of their conqueror, upon the shores of Sicily, then in the hands of the Goths, and in a single campaign wrested that island from their grasp. The next year he crossed the Sicilian straits and entered upon the conquest of the peninsula.

The most noteworthy episode of the long struggle which followed was the defense of Rome by Belisarius, into which city the imperial forces had thrown themselves. The little Roman garrison was here besieged by a barbarian army of

[1] See *Rome: Its Rise and Fall*, pars. 222 and 279.

over one hundred thousand under the command of the Gothic king Witiges (A.D. 537).

The investment lasted an entire year, during which time the Goths attempted again and again to carry the defenses by assault, but without success. Fifty thousand barbarians are estimated to have fallen before the walls of the capital. Nor were the losses of the besieged any less considerable. A large proportion of the population of the city perished from hunger, disease, and the various accidents of war, while the city itself suffered irreparable damage. All of the eleven aqueducts constructed under the consuls and Cæsars were destroyed by the barbarians, and, with the exception of three, have remained in a ruined state ever since. Many of the architectural monuments within the city were either wholly or partially demolished and the material used in strengthening the fortifications. The stately mausoleum of Hadrian was converted into a fortress, and the numerous masterpieces of Greek and Roman art which embellished it were used as missiles and flung down upon the heads of the assailants.[2]

During the siege Belisarius sent repeated and urgent embassies to his master at Constantinople, asking for immediate relief. Small reinforcements were at length thrown into the city; and the Goths, despairing of the reduction of the place, broke up camp and commenced a hasty retreat northward, closely pursued by Belisarius, who at last drove them within the walls of Ravenna. Witiges was finally compelled to surrender and was sent a prisoner to Constantinople (540).

At this moment, when the conquest of Italy was all but accomplished, the emperor, moved probably by jealousy, recalled Belisarius, and before long the Goths, under a new and able leader, Totila (or Baduila) by name, were again in

[2] The celebrated statue known as the "Barberini Faun," now in the museum at Munich, was in the seventeenth century dug up out of the rubbish at the foot of the mausoleum. Possibly it was one of the precious missiles used by the defenders of the place to repel the attack of the Goths. See Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. iv, p. 204.

possession of Rome (A.D. 546). They drove every soul out of the city and then evacuated it themselves, having first dismantled its walls. "For forty days or more," declares a chronicler, "Rome was so desolate that no one, either man or beast, remained there."

Having been sent back to regain what had been so foolishly lost, Belisarius repaired the walls of Rome and regarrisoned the city. But the jealous emperor did not support his general with either troops or money, and finally recalling him abandoned Italy to the Goths (A.D. 548).

But the entreaties of the pope and of the Italians at length moved Justinian to make another attempt to expel the barbarians. The command of the imperial forces was this time intrusted to the aged general Narses, who, in the execution of the undertaking, evinced military capacity second only to that of Belisarius. He soon obtained possession of Rome, this making the fifth time that the unfortunate city had changed hands during the reign of Justinian. All Italy was at length wrested from the barbarians, and became once more a part of the Roman empire (A.D. 553).

The remnants of the Gothic nation, upon their promising never to return, were allowed to leave Italy. They crossed the Alps and "disappeared into the northern darkness."[3]

Belisarius never received from his imperial master the reward due his genius, service, and fidelity. Justinian plainly was jealous of him. He listened to every whisper against him suggested by envy or malice, and finally, on an unproved and doubtless unfounded charge of disloyalty,[4] laid restraint upon his liberty, and confiscated his property. After a time, however, the veteran commander was discharged from surveillance; but the injustice of his master seems to have broken the spirit

[3] Besides recovering from the barbarians Africa and Italy, Justinian also reconquered from the Visigoths the southeastern part of Spain.

[4] Belisarius was not guilty of treason, but he does seem to have been justly charged with having amassed a vast fortune through the appropriation of an illegal share of the war booty secured in his various campaigns.

of the old soldier and he died a few months after his release[5] (A.D. 565). His ungrateful sovereign followed him in less than a year.

63. Justinian as a Builder. — Justinian was the Hadrian of the East. His taste for building induced him to spend enormous sums not only upon the embellishment of his capital, but also in the construction of churches, hospitals, aqueducts, and various other monuments in almost every part of his empire. His most ambitious architectural undertaking was the rebuilding with increased splendor of the church of St. Sophia, which, founded by Constantine the Great, had been burned during a riot early in his own reign. The edifice still stands, although the cross that originally surmounted the dome was long ago replaced by the Moslem crescent. The admiration which the stately structure never fails to excite in the mind of every beholder justifies the pride of the imperial builder, who, in the midst of the dedication service, is said to have exclaimed, "I have surpassed thee, O Solomon!"

64. Introduction of the Silk Industry. — The introduction and establishment in Europe of the industry of silk production deserves special notice as one of the important matters of a reign so crowded with significant events as to render it an epoch in history.

Before the time of Justinian the markets of the West were supplied with silk from China, where the culture of the mulberry-feeding silkworm had been carried on as one of the most important industries of the country from time immemorial. The precious material was brought to Europe, sometimes by sea, but more usually over the Asian land routes of travel. It was a highly prized article of luxury, the more delicate fabrics being worth, it is said, their weight in gold.

[5] There is no foundation for the story with which romancers have embellished the close of the life of Belisarius. "That he was deprived of his eyes," says Gibbon, "and reduced by envy to beg his bread, 'Give a penny to Belisarius the general!' is a fiction of later times which has obtained credit, or rather favor, as a strange example of the vicissitudes of fortune."

The Chinese guarded jealously their industry, and would not allow the worms to be carried out of the country. Their watchfulness, however, was eluded by two Persian monks, who having concealed in a hollow cane some eggs of the silk-worm, made their way out of the empire without detection, and finally reached Constantinople safely with these "spoils of the East," — spoils far more valuable than any which had ever been borne to the Old Rome by her most successful generals. The eggs were safely hatched and the species was rapidly propagated, so that in a short time the silk industry of Europe became an important factor in her industrial life.

65. The Code of Justinian. — Among all the acts of Justinian, that which conferred the most signal benefit upon succeeding ages and which entitles his name to a place among the few illustrious princes whose authority and opportunities have been devoted to advancing the well-being of their fellow-men, was the collection and publication of the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, the "Body of the Roman Law." This work embodied all the law knowledge of the ancient Romans, and was the most precious legacy of Rome to the world. Upon it are founded, as we have already learned, the law systems of most of the leading states of modern Europe, while the jurisprudence of all the others has been more or less influenced by it (par. 59). In causing its publication, Justinian earned the title of "The Lawgiver of Civilization."

66. Closing of the Schools of Athens. — It was during the reign of Justinian that the schools of rhetoric and philosophy at Athens were closed by imperial edict. Their suppression excites our astonishment, as the act at first blush seems strangely at variance with the disposition of a sovereign to whom we are indebted for the preservation and transmission of the laws and legal learning of the Roman period.

It was, in part at least, his religious scruples which led the emperor to close the Athenian schools. Their teachings and methods were deemed by Justinian to be unfriendly to

Christianity, as they set reason before faith; and for this cause, together with political reasons, perhaps, he issued the decree which forever silenced the eloquence of the Attic Academy and Lyceum.

The intellectual history of Hellas begins in the sixth century before Christ with the Seven Sages, and now it ends in the sixth century after Christ with the Seven Exiles. These seven teachers — Diogenes, Hermias, Simplicius, Eulalius, Damascius, Priscian, and Isidore by name — resolved to seek in Persia that freedom of thought which the royal edict forbade them to exercise in their own land. But in that distant country the exile philosophers found life distasteful, and consequently, although they had found a good friend in the great Chosroes, they soon returned to Europe, where they lived in silence and died in obscurity. With them passed away that long line of Grecian sages who for twelve hundred years had occupied the proud position of teachers of the world.

67. Calamities of Justinian's Reign. — Although the reign of Justinian was in many respects auspicious and brilliant, still it was for the empire a time of almost unparalleled woes and sufferings.

Among the calamitous events of the period a prominent place must be given the seditions at Constantinople and the attendant destruction of property and loss of life. The parties or factions indulging in these disorders grew out of the chariot races of the circus. These games possessed a strange and fatal fascination for the populace of the capital, such as the gladiatorial spectacles had had for the debased multitudes of Old Rome. The people became divided into two leading factions, known as the Blues and the Greens. These factions carried their rivalries into all the relations of life, political and religious, and became ultimately a terrible menace to the peace and good order of society. Often they indulged in unseemly disturbances, even in the presence of the emperor himself, in the circus.

In the year 532 there broke out what is known as the "Nika" riot. In this instance the Greens and the Blues united their forces against the government and maliciously set fire to the city. For five days a conflagration, almost as disastrous to the New Rome as the Great Fire in Nero's reign was to the Old Rome, raged in the heart of the capital. Palaces, baths, churches, porticoes, and buildings of every description were reduced to ruins. The mob was finally enticed by Justinian within the Hippodrome, where it was set upon by the soldiers of Belisarius and thirty-five thousand of the rioters were slain.

To sedition were added the scourges of war, pestilence, and famine. Under the visitation of these desolating agencies the number of the human race sensibly diminished. Some of the fairest regions of the earth, depopulated at this time, have remained almost without inhabitants up to the present day. The wars in Africa against the Vandals, and the tumults arising from religious disputes, wasted the population of that region; the Gothic wars, which drew their slow length through twenty years, cost Italy millions of her population; the Persian wars resulted in frightful losses of soldiers and of the inhabitants of cities; while the constant incursions of the outside barbarians — Turanians, Slavs, and Teutons — kept the land in almost every quarter of the empire wet with blood.

The hostile agencies of nature combined, too, with the destructive and malignant energies of man himself, and seemed to threaten the extermination of the human species. Earthquakes following one another with unparalleled frequency and violence, rolled beneath cities and provinces, and carried death and dismay everywhere. Berytus and Antioch on the Syrian coast were destroyed, an immense number of persons perishing in the overthrow of the latter city.

Famine prepared the way for the awful pestilence which, bred probably in Egypt, fell upon the empire in the year 542, and did not wholly cease its ravages until about fifty years

later. This plague was the most terrible scourge of which history has any knowledge, save perhaps the so-called Black Death, which afflicted Europe in the fourteenth century (par. 321). It is believed to have carried off one-third of the population of the empire.

The last increment to the misery and wretchedness of the subjects of the empire, particularly of the poor peasantry, was added by the heavy taxation that the extravagant expenditures of the emperor made necessary. In its exhausting effects upon the empire, Justinian's outwardly brilliant reign has been likened to that of Louis XIV of France.

68. The Reign of Heraclius (A.D. 610–641). — For half a century after the death of Justinian, the annals of the Byzantine empire are unimportant. Then we reach the reign of Heraclius, a prince about whose worthy name gather matters of significance in world-history.

About this time Chosroes II, king of Persia, wrested from the empire the fortified cities that guarded the Euphratean frontier, and overran all Syria, Egypt, and Asia Minor. What was known as the True Cross was torn from the church at Jerusalem and carried off in triumph to Persia. To add to the gloom and distress of the inhabitants of the empire, the Avars were desolating its Balkan provinces and spreading their ravages to the very gates of Byzantium.

Thus beset on every side, Heraclius resolved to abandon Constantinople, escape to Carthage, and make that city the seat of the imperial government.[6] His ships were already packed with the furniture of the palace, when the patriarch

[6] A variety of motives, doubtless, led Heraclius to this determination, just as Constantine was influenced by many considerations when he transferred the capital from the Tiber to the Bosporus. The imperial government, Roman in its spirit and tendencies, was in antagonism with the native populations of the East. It was, in fact, regarded by its subjects as a foreign domination, and was in no sense national. By removing the seat of government to Carthage, which was a thoroughly Roman city, Heraclius might hope to get rid of the Greek *influence* that surrounded the court at Constantinople, and to strengthen his *administration by basing* it on a loyal Roman population.

of Constantinople interposed. He exhorted the disheartened emperor never to despair of the cause of the empire and of the Church, and by entreaties and gentle commands led him to abandon his desperate resolution, and to take a solemn oath that he would never remove the throne from the spot where Constantine and the will of God had established it.

For many years Heraclius battled heroically with the assailants of the empire. One of his campaigns deserves a place among the brilliant military exploits of history. In order to compel Chosroes, whose armies were distressing the Roman provinces, to call his soldiers home, Heraclius conceived the project of an invasion of the Persian empire. For the accomplishment of this daring undertaking, — which presents a striking parallel to the invasion of Africa by the Roman general Scipio in the Second Punic War in order to compel the Carthaginians to call Hannibal out of Italy to the defense of Carthage, — Heraclius chose a company of only five thousand men, with whom he sailed through the Black Sea to the port of Trebizond (A.D. 623). Having recruited his little army from among the hardy mountaineers of Armenia, he pushed on into the heart of Persia. One city after another fell into his hands; and in revenge for the insults heaped by the infidels upon the Christian churches, the altars of the fire-worshipers were everywhere overturned and the fires upon them quenched. Thebarmes, the place held sacred by tradition as the birthplace of Zoroaster, was laid in ruins, in special revenge for the desecration of the holy places of Jerusalem.

Trembling for the safety of his throne, Chosroes hastily recalled his armies from the remote provinces whither their victorious career had led them, and as they arrived, disposed them in such a manner as to form a perfect cordon about the little army of the brave Heraclius. But the Persian armies were as powerless now to withstand the valor of the West as they were ten centuries before. Being scattered in every direction, they sought safety behind the walls of their cities.

After besieging and capturing one of these, Heraclius set out on his return.

This daring expedition of Heraclius, although it doubtless saved the empire from immediate dismemberment and inspired its inhabitants with new courage, by no means ended the war. The Persians now made a counter attack. They penetrated to the heart of the Roman empire, and laid siege to Constantinople, in which enterprise they were aided by the united hordes of the Avars and Slavs. But the attempt was unsuccessful, and they were obliged, after sustaining heavy losses, to abandon the siege.

The exhausting struggle between the two rival empires was at last decided by a terrible combat known as the battle of Nineveh (A.D. 627), which was fought upon or near the ruins of the old Assyrian capital. The Persian army was almost annihilated.

Chosroes sought safety among the mountains of Susiana. He soon met the fate almost sure to overtake an unfortunate monarch in the East. One of his sons headed a revolt, put to death eighteen brothers who might dispute the succession with him, and cast the aged Chosroes into prison. In a few days grief or violence ended his life. With him passed away the glory of the Second Persian empire.

The new king, Siroes, negotiated a treaty of peace with Heraclius (A.D. 628), in which he gave up all the conquests of his father, surrendered the prisoners and standards that had fallen into the hands of the Persians, and restored the "True Cross," which had been carried off by Chosroes. The articles of this treaty left the boundaries of the two rival powers unchanged. Heraclius, whose rare abilities, desperate daring, and resolution had rescued the empire and Church from threatened destruction, was received at Constantinople with acclaim as the "New Scipio."

69. The Approaching Storm. — The two combatants in the *fierce struggle which* we have been watching were too much

absorbed in their contentions to notice the approach of a storm from the deserts of Arabia, — a storm destined to overwhelm both alike in its destructive course.

Within a few years from the date of the battle of Nineveh the Saracens entered upon their surprising career of conquest, which in a short time completely changed the face of the entire East, and set the Crescent, the emblem of a new faith, alike above the fire-altars of Persia and the churches of the empire. Only a few years elapsed after the death of the great Chosroes, before the dominions of the Persian kings were overrun by the Arabian conquerors; and Heraclius himself lived to see — so cruel are the vicissitudes of fortune — the very provinces which he had wrested from the hands of the fire-worshipers in the possession of the followers of Mohammed.

But these seeming misfortunes, so far as they concerned the Roman empire, were really blessings in disguise. The empire was actually strengthened by what it lost. The conquests of the Saracens cut off those provinces that had the smallest Greek element, and thus rendered the population subject to the emperor more homogeneous, more thoroughly Greek. The Roman element disappeared, and though the government still retained the imperial character impressed upon it by the conquerors of the world, the court of Constantinople became Greek in tone, spirit, and manners. Hence, instead of longer applying to the empire the designation *Roman*, many writers from this on call it the *Greek* or *Byzantine* empire.

70. Services rendered European Civilization by the Roman Empire in the East.[7] — The later Roman empire rendered such eminent services to the European world that it justly deserves an important place in universal history. First, as a military outpost it held the Eastern frontier of European civilization for a thousand years against Asiatic barbarism. The historian Bury would have us think of Heraclius, Leo the Isaurian, and

[7] Bury's *History of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. ii, chap. xiv.

other emperors and warriors like them, as "the successors of Themistocles and Africanus."

Second, it was the keeper for centuries of the treasures of ancient civilization, and the instructress of the new Western nations in law, in government and administration, in literature, in painting, in architecture, and in the industrial arts.[8]

Third, it kept alive the imperial idea and principle, and gave this fruitful idea and this moulding principle back to the West in the time of Charles the Great. Without the later Roman empire of the East there would never have been a Romano-German empire of the West (par. 102).

Fourth, it was the teacher of religion and civilization to the Slavic races of Eastern Europe. Russia forms part of the civilized world to-day by virtue of what she received from New Rome.

Sources and Source Material. — The *Institutes* of Justinian. There are many English translations of this work; that by Moyle will perhaps be found the most satisfactory.

Secondary or Modern Works. — GIBBON (E.), *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Bury's ed. recommended), chaps. xl–xliv, on the reign of Justinian. Chap. xliv deals with Roman jurisprudence. OMAN (C.), **The Story of the Byzantine Empire* (Story of the Nations), chaps. iv–xi; and, by the same author, *The Dark Ages*, chaps. iii, v, vi, ix, and xii. HODGKIN (T.), **Italy and her Invaders*, vol. iv, "The Imperial Restoration." RAWLINSON (GEO.), *The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy*, chap. xxiv. *Ency. Brit.*, Art. on Justinian by James Bryce. BURY (J. B.), *History of the Later Roman Empire*, 2 vols. A work of superior scholarship. HARRISON (F.), *Byzantine History in the Early Middle Ages*. A brilliant lecture, which summarizes the results of the latest studies in the field indicated. FINLAY (G.), *History of Greece* (ed. by Tozer), vol. i, "Greece under the Romans."

[8] This instruction was imparted largely through the mediation of the Italian cities, and particularly of Venice, which throughout almost all the mediæval time were in close political or commercial relations with Constantinople.

CHAPTER VI

MOHAMMED AND THE SARACENS

71. Origin and Character of the Arabs. — The Arabs, who are now about to play their surprising part in history, are, after the Hebrews and the Phœnicians, the most important people of the Semitic race. Tradition traces their descent from Ishmael, the son of Abraham. The name "Saracen," applied to them, is of doubtful origin, but seems to come from two Arabic words meaning "children of the desert." They are divided into two distinct classes, — dwellers in towns and dwellers in tents. It is to the latter class alone that the term "Bedawin" is properly applied. These nomad Arabs, who comprise probably about one-fifth of the population of Arabia, have never been better described than in the Bible account of their origin, where Hagar, while comforted with the promise that her son shall become the father of a great nation, is told that "he shall be a wild man and his hand shall be against every man and every man's hand shall be against him." The virtues which they prize most highly are hospitality, generosity, and fidelity to the ties of kinship.

Secure in their inaccessible deserts, the Arabs have never as a nation bowed their necks to a foreign conqueror, although portions of the Arabian peninsula have been repeatedly subjugated by different invaders.

72. Religious Condition of Arabia before Mohammed. — The religion of the Arabs before the reforms of Mohammed was a sort of mixture of fetichism and star-worship. In the minds of many at least there seems to have been a dim perception of the *unity of* God, or rather of a Supreme God.

The holy city of Mecca was the center of the religious life of all the Arabian tribes. Here was the ancient and most revered shrine of the Kaaba,[1] where were set up between three and four hundred idols. Here also was preserved a sacred black stone that was believed to have been given by an angel to Abraham. To this Meccan shrine pilgrimages were made from the most remote parts of Arabia.

But though a debased polytheism was the prevailing religion of the Arabian tribes, still there were many followers of other faiths; for Arabia at this time, in happy and reproving contrast to almost every other country, was a land of religious freedom. Hence religious exiles from every land fled hither as to an asylum, and finding here a toleration that they sought in vain elsewhere, freely expounded their diverse doctrines in different parts of the peninsula. The altar of the Persian fire-worshiper rose alongside the Jewish synagogue and the Christian church. The Jews especially were to be found in many districts in great numbers, having been driven from Palestine by the Roman persecutions. From them the Arab teachers had been made acquainted with the doctrine of one sole God. From the numerous Christian converts dwelling among them they had learned something of the doctrines of Christianity. This faith had also been especially forced upon their attention by the strangely austere lives of the Christian anchorites of the Syrian desert. In view of these antecedents of the religion which Mohammed gave his people, his creed appears to some scholars, as for instance Emanuel Deutsch, to be essentially "Judaism as adapted to Arabia," while to others it presents itself as an heretical or modified form of Christianity.

About the time to which we have now brought our narrative there was much religious unrest in Arabia. As it was in Judæa at the time of the appearance of Christ, so was it now in this southern land. There were here many seekers after God,[2]

[1] So named from its having the shape of a cube.

[2] Reformers called *Hanyfs*, or *Hanifs*, that is, "Puritans."

men who had become dissatisfied with the old idolatry and were ready to embrace a purer and higher faith.

Such was the religious condition of the tribes of Arabia about the beginning of the seventh century of our era, when there appeared among them a prophet under whose teachings the followers of all the idolatrous worships were led to give assent to a single and simple creed, and were animated by a fanatical enthusiasm that drove them forth from their deserts upon a career of conquest which could not be stayed until they had overrun the fairest portions of the Roman and Persian empires, and given a new religion to a large part of the human race.

73. **Mohammed.** — Mohammed, the great prophet of the Arabs, was born in the holy city of Mecca, probably in the year 570. He sprang from the distinguished tribe of the Koreish, the custodians of the sacred shrine of the Kaaba. At the age of twelve or thirteen he is said to have visited, in company with his uncle, the bazaars of Damascus and other Syrian towns, and thus early to have learned something of the outside world. However this may be, it is certain that in his early years he was a shepherd and a watcher of flocks by night, as the great religious teachers Moses and David had been before him. Later he became a merchant and a camel-driver. Having been intrusted with the management of the estate of a certain widow named Cadijah, his faithfulness, in connection with the graces of a person of unusual beauty and the fascinations of a gifted mind, won her esteem and affection, and she became his wife.

Mohammed possessed a soul that was early and deeply stirred by the contemplation of those themes that ever attract the religious mind. When the fast of Ramadan approached, — a month set apart for humiliation and prayer, — he was wont to withdraw from his family and the world, to a cave on Mount Hira, a few miles from Mecca, and there spend long vigils in religious exercises and contemplation.

It is in connection with these visits to this solitary chamber that we find the mystery of Mohammed's life. He declared that there he had visions — afterwards repeated elsewhere — in which the angel Gabriel appeared to him and made to him revelations which he was commanded to make known to his fellow-men. The starting-point of the new faith which he was to teach was this: "There is no God save Allah, and Mohammed is his Prophet."

Mohammed communicated the nature of his visions to his wife, who, while not doubting the reality of the visitations, knew not whether to attribute them to a good or an evil spirit. Finally she became convinced that the visits were from a good angel, acknowledged the divine mission of her husband, and became his first convert.

For a long time Mohammed now endeavored to gain adherents merely by persuasion; but such was the incredulity with which he everywhere met, that at the end of three years his disciples numbered only forty persons. But he had gained two staunch friends in his relatives, Abu Bekr and Ali, and to these were soon added a third, Omar by name, all of whom were destined to become illustrious champions of the new faith.

74. The Hegira (622). — The teachings of Mohammed at last aroused the anger of a powerful party among the Koreish, who feared that they, as the guardians of the national idols of the Kaaba, would be compromised in the eyes of the other tribes by allowing such heresy to be openly taught by one of their number, and accordingly they began to persecute Mohammed and his followers.

These persecutions led to the flight of many of the new converts to the Christian kingdom of Abyssinia (615). Mohammed, however, remained in Mecca. Plots were now formed against his life, and he resolved to flee to the neighboring city of Medina.[8] He was saved from assassination,

[8] Known as Yathreb before the "Flight."

while attempting to escape, by the devoted Ali, who, wrapping himself in his master's mantle, occupied his couch, while Abu Bekr was conducting the prophet, under cover of night, to a cave a short distance from Mecca. From this temporary hiding place Mohammed continued his flight to Medina.

This *Hegira*, or "flight," as the word signifies, occurred in the year 622, and was considered by the Moslems as such an important event in the history of their religion that they adopted it as the beginning of a new era.

75. Mohammed at Medina. — At this time Medina was merely a cluster of clan-villages on an oasis of the desert. Bitter feuds divided the clans, and the community was in a state of genuine Arab anarchy. Mohammed at once assumed the functions of an arbiter and lawgiver. He framed for the community a remarkable charter or constitution, which united the warring clans into a little commonwealth, — the nucleus of the great Arabian empire. His government was a theocracy, like that of ancient Israel. Mohammed was not now, as while at Mecca, simply a prophet, but a legislator, judge, and king. It is only by bearing in mind his changed position that we shall understand his work at Medina and be enabled to judge it justly.

As prophet, Mohammed continued to make known the revelations that came to him. A large part of the Koran, but not the part of loftiest religious feeling, was given at Medina. In the little rude mosque which he had caused to be built as a place of devotion and assemblage, the apostle preached to the people and led them in the service of prayer. In this service he made an innovation of the greatest significance. At first he had enjoined upon his followers in praying to turn, as did the Jews, towards Jerusalem, but failing in his efforts to win over this people, of whom there was a large number settled in the suburbs of Medina, and to persuade them to recognize him as a true prophet, he broke with them, and commanded his disciples in praying to turn towards Mecca. This meant that the attempt to effect a fusion of Judaism and Islam had

failed, and that Islam was to run its course as a distinct religion.

As lawgiver and judge, Mohammed decided the various cases, civil and religious, brought to him. The decisions rendered by him and the precedents he set form the chief basis of the law system of the Moslem world to-day.

As chief or king, Mohammed, like his prototype David, planned and led border raids and military campaigns. The year after the Hegira he sent out an expedition to intercept a caravan of the Koreish and to make it a prize. This was in strict accord with Arab rule and custom, for the Koreish in expelling Mohammed from Mecca and in attempting to kill him had established a state of war between him and themselves. This marauding soon led to a pitched battle, the so-called battle of Bedr (624), between the Meccans and the followers of Mohammed, which resulted in a signal victory for the Moslems. This was the beginning of the holy wars of Islam.[4]

As the guardian of the infant state, Mohammed either expelled or caused to be put to death the disturbers of its peace and security. Chief among these public and personal enemies were the Jews. Because of their persistent hostility towards the new religion, Mohammed expelled from the country two of the three Jewish clans; the third, which in a critical moment had proved traitorous, he exterminated. All the men to the number of eight hundred he caused to be beheaded, and the women and children to be sold into slavery.

In the tenth year of the Hegira, the Meccans having violated a truce which they had entered into with the new state at Medina, Mohammed at the head of an army of ten thousand Bedawîn marched against Mecca, and captured the city almost

[4] Mohammed about this time gave his followers the following revelation, which had great influence in securing for early Islam its remarkable military successes: "And those who are slain in God's cause, their works shall not go wrong; He * * * will make them enter into Paradise which he has told them of." — THE KORAN, sura xlvii, 5 (Palmer's trans.).

without a blow. The prophet dealt most magnanimously with his former persecutors. Only a very few were proscribed. It was the idols alone in the place that were given over to destruction. Entering the Kaaba, Mohammed exclaimed, "Truth has come and error has fled away." He then ordered that all the idols there should be hewn down.

The capture of Mecca constitutes a great landmark in the career of Islam. The Arabian tribes now almost unanimously turned to Mohammed as a true prophet. During the year following the fall of Mecca so many embassies of submission came to him that this is called the "Year of Deputations." The once rejected prophet had become the spiritual and military head of the innumerable Arab clans, whom the intense ardor of religious enthusiasm had welded into a mighty brotherhood and nation.

There is nothing outside the realm of miracles more wonderful than this quick triumph of Islam over the Arab race and the change wrought in them by the force of a great conviction.[5]

In the founding of the Moslem empire, Mohammed without doubt was guilty of many cruel and unjust acts; but it is also equally certain that the establishment of his empire was attended by less injustice and cruelty than marks the establishment of any other Asiatic state known to history — from the Kingdom of Israel in Palestine to the British Empire in India.

76. Mohammed's Embassies to Heraclius and Chosroes. — Even before Arabia had become entirely obedient to his creed, Mohammed began to entertain visions of a universal empire.

Shortly after the Hegira he sent embassies to Heraclius, the Eastern emperor, to Chosroes II of Persia, and to other princes, demanding their allegiance to him as the Apostle of the only God. Heraclius and the rulers of Egypt and Abyssinia gave the ambassadors a courteous hearing; but Chosroes tore in pieces the letter of the prophet. When Mohammed

[5] Without doubt, as is maintained by many, the Arab's love of warfare and hope of plunder had much to do in bringing about this amazing revolution; but, as in the case of the later crusading movement in Christendom, we shall not be wrong in making religious feeling its chief moving principle.

heard of the act, he is said to have exclaimed prophetically, "Thus shall God rend asunder the empire of Chosroes."

77. The Death of the Prophet. — Mohammed's life was just sufficiently prolonged to enable him to set the Arabian tribes on their marvelous career of foreign conquest. Upon the ground of an insult to one of his ambassadors he declared war against Heraclius, and wrested from the empire several frontier cities. These were the only conquests made beyond the limits of the peninsula during the prophet's lifetime.

In the tenth year of the Hegira Mohammed made a farewell pilgrimage to Mecca. He there spoke to a vast throng of forty thousand pilgrims, closing what he felt to be his last public address with these words: "O Lord, I have delivered my message and fulfilled my mission." A few months later he died, and was buried at Medina, and his tomb there is to-day a most sacred place of pilgrimage for the Moslem world.

78. The Origin of the Koran. — Before going on to trace the conquests of the successors of Mohammed, we must try to form some idea of the religion of the great prophet.

The doctrines of Mohammedanism, or Islam, which means "submission to God," are contained in the Koran, which is believed by the orthodox to have been written from all eternity on tablets in heaven. From time to time the apostle recited[6] to his disciples portions of the "heavenly book" as its contents were revealed to him in his dreams and visions. These communications were held in the "breasts of men," or were written down upon bones, pieces of pottery, and the ribs of palm leaves. Soon after the death of the prophet these scraps of writing were religiously collected, supplemented by tradition, and then arranged chiefly according to length. Thus came into existence the sacred book of Islam.

79. The Contents of the Koran. — The fundamental doctrine of the creed embodied in the Koran is the unity of God:

[6] Palmer in the introduction to his translation of the Koran says that it is "probable Mohammed could neither read nor write."

"There is no God save Allah" echoes through the book. To this is added the equally binding declaration that "Mohammed is the Prophet of Allah."

The Koran inculcates four cardinal virtues. The first of these is prayer: five times every day must the believer turn his face towards Mecca and engage in devotion. The second requirement is almsgiving. The third is keeping the fast of Ramadan, which lasts a whole month. The fourth duty is making a pilgrimage to Mecca. Every person who can possibly do so is required to make this journey.

To the faithful the Koran promises a heaven filled with every sensual delight, with flowers and fruits and bright-eyed houris of ravishing beauty, and threatens unbelievers and the doers of evil with the torments of a hell filled with every horror of flame and demon.[7]

80. The Sunna. — Islam is not based upon the Koran alone. It rests in part upon what is known as the *Sunna*, that is, a great body of traditions of the prophet's sayings, — those not forming a part of the sacred book, — his actions, practices, and decisions handed down from his immediate companions. The first collection of these was made in the second century after Mohammed's death. These traditions are regarded by the orthodox Moslem as being almost as sacred and authoritative as the words of the Koran itself. In regard to its significance for the development of Islam, we may compare the Sunna to the body of traditions handed down alongside the Bible in the Christian Church, and which has so greatly influenced the development particularly of Catholic Christianity.

81. Abu Bekr, First Successor of Mohammed (632–634). — Upon the death of Mohammed a dispute at once arose as to his successor; for the prophet left behind no son, nor had he designated upon whom his mantle should fall. Abu Bekr, the apostle's father-in-law, was at last chosen to the position, with

[7] For descriptions of Paradise and Hell, see suras xxii, xliv, lv, lvi, lxxvii, and lxxxvii.

the title of Caliph, or Successor of the Prophet, although many claimed that the place belonged to Ali, the prophet's cousin and son-in-law, and one of his first and most faithful companions. This question of succession was destined at a later period, as we shall see (par. 87), to divide the Mohammedan world into two factions, animated by the most bitter and lasting hostility towards each other.

During the first part of his caliphate, Abu Bekr was engaged in suppressing revolts in different parts of the peninsula; for upon the death of Mohammed many of the tribes broke away from the tiresome restrictions which the prophet had put upon them, and refused to pay the tribute and alms that he had exacted. Moreover, several impostors appeared and set themselves up as prophets. Most prominent among these was Moseilama, who succeeded in attracting a large and dangerous following. But Khalid, the general of Abu Bekr, defeated the self-commissioned apostle and slew thousands of his adherents. With such revengeful swiftness and energy did Khalid reduce to subjection the seditious tribes that he gained the surname of "the Sword of God."

With affairs in Arabia, both as regards rebels and rival prophets, thus composed, Abu Bekr was free to carry out the last injunction of the prophet to his followers, which enjoined them to spread his doctrines by the sword till all men had confessed the creed of Islam, or consented to pay tribute to the faithful.

82. The Conquest of Syria and Palestine (634–637). — The country which Abu Bekr resolved first to reduce was Syria. A call addressed to all the faithful throughout Arabia was responded to with the greatest alacrity and enthusiasm. From every quarter the warriors flocked to Medina, until the desert about the city was literally covered with their black tents and crowded with men and horses and camels. After invoking the blessing of God upon the hosts, Abu Bekr sent them forward upon their holy mission.

The warriors of the caliph were successful in their first engagement in Syria, and were enabled to send to Medina a large amount of booty as the first-fruits of their crusade. The sight of spoils stirred the plundering instincts of the rovers of the desert, and soon large reinforcements were flocking from all parts of Arabia to the army in Syria.

The emperor Heraclius made a brave effort to defend the holy places against the fanatical warriors of the desert, but all in vain. His armies were cut to pieces. Seeing there was no hope of saving Jerusalem, he removed from that city to Constantinople the "True Cross," which he had rescued from the Persians (par. 68). "Farewell, Syria," were his words as he turned from the consecrated land which he saw must be given up to the enemies of his faith.

Damascus soon fell into the hands of the Arabs (634). The same day that saw the capture of this city witnessed the death of Abu Bekr. In dying he had appointed Omar as his successor. When Omar was informed of Abu Bekr's intention, it is said that he besought him to change his choice, as he had no need of the place. "But the place has need of you," was the reply of Abu Bekr; and thus Omar became the second of the successors of the prophet.

The change in the caliphate did not interrupt the operations of the Syrian army. After a short siege Jerusalem was surrendered into the hands of the Moslems (637). We must notice the articles of capitulation, for the terms imposed upon the conquered Christians by the caliphs were always the same, and having examined them in this case, there will be no occasion for our stopping to dwell upon the different negotiations that now follow one another in rapid succession.

Omar himself went to Jerusalem to receive the keys of the city, and to arrange the terms of the surrender. These were, that the Christians should not erect any new churches; that their religious houses should always be opened to Mussulman travelers, whom the monks must entertain as guests three

days; that the Christians should always stand when in the presence of a Moslem; that they should not wear the same kind of sandals or turbans as the believers; that they should not use saddles; that they should not employ the Arabic language in their inscriptions; that they should not display the Cross; and that they should not ring the bells of their churches. Beside these there were various other though less important restrictions.

After the fall of Jerusalem, the cities of Antioch and Aleppo soon yielded to the Saracen arms, and then as to all of Syria the command of the prophet had been fulfilled. During the following few years the Arabs overran the greater part of Asia Minor, and finally pitched their tents on the shores of the Black Sea and of the Hellespont. Fitting out vessels in the Syrian ports, they made descents upon the Greek cities of the Ægean. It was in one of these raids that they found the prostrate Colossus of Rhodes, which they are said to have sold for a good price to a junk dealer. From this time on, down to the opening of the nineteenth century, the pirate-ships of the Moslems were harassing almost without intermission one or another of the Christian shores of the Mediterranean lands.

83. The Conquest of Persia (632–641). — While Khalid, with other chieftains, was effecting the conquest of Syria, another lieutenant of the caliph, Sad by name, was setting afoot the conquest of Persia. Enervated as this country was by luxury, and weakened by her long wars with the Eastern emperors, she could offer but feeble resistance to the terrible energy of the Saracens. In a few years the authority of the Koran was established throughout the country.

Arabian legend declares that this triumph of Islam over the religion of Zoroaster was foreshadowed by a miracle on the night that Mohammed was born, when the flames upon the altars of the fire-worshipers, which had been kept burning from age to age, were suddenly extinguished.

84. Conquests in Central Asia. — Under the successors of Omar, the Arabs, following the footsteps of Alexander, crossed the mountains that wall Persia on the north, and effected the conquest of the regions watered by the Oxus and the Jaxartes. In these parts Islam came in contact with the Tartar races of Central Asia. The conversion of these nomadic tribes, which took place under various circumstances and at different periods, was a matter of great historical significance, for it was their swords that were destined to uphold and spread the creed of Mohammed when the fiery zeal of his own countrymen should abate, and their arms lose the dreaded power which religious fanaticism had for a moment imparted to them (chap. xv).

85. The Conquest of Egypt (640). — The reduction of Persia was not yet fully accomplished when Omar commissioned Amru, one of the chiefs whose valor had won for Islam the cities of Syria, to carry the standard of the prophet into the valley of the Nile.

Egypt was, at this time, one of the most populous and highly civilized of the countries under the rule of the Eastern emperors. Since its conquest by the Romans (30 B.C.), it had remained in the hands of the Cæsars of Rome or of Constantinople, and from its inexhaustible granaries were loaded the vast fleets of grain ships that supplied the markets of those imperial cities. It was now defended by the garrisons of Heraclius, and was further protected by the ancient renown of the Pharaohs and the Ptolemies, visions of whose glory and power still filled the imagination of the East. Omar himself, even after the army of the faithful was upon its march, began to fear lest zeal had passed into presumption in making an attack upon so powerful a state, and dispatched messengers after Amru, bidding him, if not already across the frontiers of Egypt, to turn back; but if within the country, to "trust God and his sword." Amru, surmising the contents of the letter, — which had reached him while he was yet in Syria, — marched on until across the Egyptian frontier, then opened and read it

to his soldiers. All declared with one voice that Allah had ordained that they were to plant the standard of the apostle upon the citadels of Egypt.

Pelusium, the ancient stronghold which from the times of the Pharaohs had defended the eastern frontiers of the country, was captured after a short siege, and all Egypt then lay open to the march of the Saracens. Fortunately for their bold undertaking, the Coptic Christians, the descendants of the ancient Egyptians, constituting probably nine-tenths of the population, had been alienated from the court of Constantinople by the persecutions they had endured on account of their departure from the orthodox creed of the Church. They therefore hailed as deliverers the Arabs, who promised to permit them to retain their religion upon the payment of tribute. This they were quite willing to do, as the amount they would be required to transmit to the vicar of the prophet could not in any event be larger than the exactions wrung from them by the officers of the Eastern emperor.

The imperial forces that garrisoned the capital Alexandria held out against the arms of the Saracens for more than a year, and then abandoned the city to the enemy. Amru, in communicating the intelligence of the important event to Omar, told him also about the famous Alexandrian Library, and asked what he should do with the books. Omar is said to have replied, "If these books agree with the Koran, they are useless; if they disagree, they are pernicious: in either case they ought to be destroyed." Accordingly the books were distributed among the four thousand baths of the capital, and served to feed their fires for six months.[8]

The loss of Alexandria was regarded at Constantinople as an event almost as calamitous as would have been the capture of

[8] This entire story is regarded by many critics as improbable and apocryphal. Gibbon not only doubts the fact of the destruction of the books, but refuses to lament their loss if destroyed. It is probable that the collection was partly burned during the troubles attending Julius Cæsar's invasion of Egypt; and that more of the books were destroyed by the early Christians themselves, as

that capital itself. The emperor Heraclius was so affected by the intelligence that he survived the disaster only a few days. But there was still sufficient spirit in the successors to the throne of Constantinople to prompt them to put forth repeated efforts for the recovery of the lost capital. Three times did the imperial forces obtain possession of the prize, and as often were they expelled by the Saracens, who at last destroyed the fortifications of the place, to prevent another occupation by the Romans.

86. The Caliphs Othman and Ali. — Omar fell by the hand of an assassin in the ninth year of his caliphate, and Othman (644–656) was chosen as his successor. He at once set himself to the pious work of carrying still further from Mecca the standard of the apostle of God. But dissensions and jealousies were already arising among the followers of the prophet, and the vigor and unity of effort that had characterized the caliphates of Abu Bekr and Omar, and given irresistible might to the Moslem arms, were no longer to be found in the councils of Mecca. Othman soon had a strong party arrayed against him, and finally he was assassinated in his own house, in the eighty-second year of his age and the twelfth of his reign. Ali (656–661), the son-in-law of Mohammed, — he had married Fatima, the daughter of the prophet, — was, after some delay, chosen or rather declared caliph.

87. The Establishment of the Dynasty of the Ommeiades (661). — The quarrel of the several parties at last broke out in civil war. Ali was scarcely placed in the caliphate before he was forced to send an army against a pretender, Moawiyah by name, who had set up a rival court at Damascus, and whose claims were supported by the able and ambitious Amrou, the conqueror of Egypt. Three men, with a view to removing the

being the " monuments of idolatry." The famous dilemma about the uselessness or perniciousness of the books is one of those sayings that have been accorded a various parentage. The sentiment *mutatis mutandis* has been attributed among others to Bishop Theophilus of Alexandria, who lived about the close of the fourth century, and who displayed a fanatical hostility to everything classical.

causes of discord, planned the assassination of Ali, Moawiyah, and Amru. The last two escaped the fate intended for them, but Ali fell a victim to the conspiracy (661).

Ali was the fourth and last of those caliphs who were relatives or close companions of Mohammed, and whose acts and decisions for that reason possess an authority second only to that of the words and practices of the prophet himself.

Moawiyah was now recognized as caliph. He succeeded in making the office hereditary instead of elective or appointive, as it had been hitherto, and thus established what is known as the dynasty of the Ommeiades,[9] the rulers of which family for nearly a century (661–750) issued their commands from the city of Damascus.

In securing their power the Ommeiades had caused the murder of the two sons of Ali, — Hassan and Hosain. These youths were ever regarded as martyrs by the friends of the house of Ali, and their untimely and cruel fate served to render perpetual the feuds whose beginning we have seen (par. 81). Notwithstanding all the mutations of sovereignties and races in the Mohammedan world, these early dissensions have been kept alive, and still divide the disciples of the prophet into two factions that cherish the most implacable hatred towards each other.[10]

88. The Conquest of Northern Africa (643–689). — But notwithstanding these feuds and divisions, during the reigns of Othman, Ali, and their immediate successors, Northern Africa was subjugated from Egypt to the Straits of Gibraltar. The lieutenants of the caliphs, however, were obliged to do much and fierce fighting before they obtained possession of these

[9] So called from Omeyyah, an ancestor of Moawiyah.

[10] The Mohammedans of Persia, who are known as Shiahs, are the leaders of the party of Ali, while the Turks and Arabs, known as Sunnites, are the chief adherents of the opposite party. These latter take their name from the fact that they hold the Sunna (par. 80) as sacred and authoritative. The Shiahs, on the other hand, reject all these traditions of the prophet save such as can be traced back to Ali or to his immediate posterity.

often disputed shores. They had to contend not only with the Græco-Roman Christians of the coast, but to battle with the idolatrous Moors of the interior. Furthermore, all Europe had begun to feel alarm at the threatening progress of the Saracens, and to view with apprehension their rapid advance towards the west; so now Roman soldiers from Constantinople and Gothic warriors from Italy and Spain hastened across the sea to aid in the protection of Carthage and to help arrest the alarming progress of these enthusiasts of the desert.

But all was of no avail. Destiny had given to the followers of the prophet the land of Hannibal and Augustine. Akbar, Hassan, and other valiant chiefs of the Moslems turned repeated defeat into ultimate victory. The long and desperate struggle was illustrated, as were all the campaigns of the Arabs, by surprising exploits of valor and splendid examples of religious zeal. Even before Carthage had been taken, Akbar, regardless of the fact that he was leaving a host of enemies in his rear, led his followers along the shore to the westernmost limits of the continent, and then, urging his horse into the waters of the Atlantic, cried, "Great God! if my course were not stopped by this sea, I would still go on to the unknown kingdoms of the West, preaching the unity of thy holy name, and putting to the sword the rebellious nations who worship any other gods than thee" (689).

It was not until several years after this that Carthage fell finally into the hands of the Arabs. Its Roman and Gothic defenders were driven to their ships, the city was burnt, and every vestige of the capital as carefully erased as it had been by the unrelenting Romans a thousand years before. Nothing save a few hovels has since marked the spot.

The half-Romanized provincials of the coast, — such as the ravages of the Vandalic wars and the swords of the Moslems had spared, — the Moors of the interior, and the Saracens, gradually melted into a single race confessing the creed and speaking the language of the conquerors; and to-day it would

be impossible to distinguish the swarthy Arab Moor of Northern Africa from the tawny Bedawi of Syria or Arabia.

By this conquest all the countries of North Africa, whose history for a thousand years and more had been intertwined with that of the opposite shores of Europe, and which at one time seemed destined to share the career of freedom and progress opening to the people of that continent, were drawn back into the fatalism, the despotism, and the stagnation of the East. From being an extension of Europe they became once more a mere extension of Asia. Henceforth, until towards the end of the nineteenth century, we shall have occasion to notice their affairs only incidentally, and then only as the piratical tribes of the degenerate coast shall need to be chastised by the Christian sovereigns of Europe, or by the government of the Great Republic beyond the sea invaded by the chieftain Akbar.

89. Attacks upon Constantinople. — Within fifty years from the death of Mohammed his standard had been carried by the lieutenants of his successors through Asia Minor to the Hellespont, on the one side, and across Africa to the Straits of Gibraltar, on the other. From both of these points, so remote from each other, the fanatic warriors of the desert were casting longing glances across the narrow passages of water, which alone separated them from the single continent that their swift coursers had not yet traversed, or whence the spoils of the unbelievers had not yet been borne to the feet of the vicar of the prophet of God. We may expect to see the Saracens at one or both of these points attempt the invasion of Europe.

The first attempt was made in the East (673), where the Arabs endeavored to gain control of the Bosporus by wresting Constantinople from the hands of the Eastern emperors. After incurring heavy losses, they abandoned the undertaking.

In 717–718 the city was again invested by a powerful Saracen army and fleet; but the indomitable spirit of the emperor, Leo the Isaurian, and the fortunate possession by the besieged


GREATEST EXTENT
of the
SARACEN DOMINIONS
C.A.D. 750
FRANCIA
AQUITANIA
BURGUNDY
Tours
Orleans
Narbonne
Arles
Luna
Ravenna
Pisa
Rome
M. Cassino
Naples
Amalfi
Salerno
CORSICA
SARDINIA
BALEARIC IS.
ANDALOS
Toledo
Zaragoza
Ebro R.
Lisbon
Tagus R.
Merida
Seville
Cordova
Granada
Cadiz
Guadiana R.
Guadalquivir R.
Gibraltar
Strait of Gibraltar
Tangier
Ceuta
MOROCCO
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
Palermo
SICILY
Syracuse
MALTA
Kairouan
Tripoli
AFRICA
Danube R.
Thessalonica
Otranto
Hadrianople
MACEDONIA
Athens
CRETE
RHODES
Alexandria
Longitude
East


30
33
40
45
50
55
60
65
70
75
80
T U R K S
Jazartes R.
A C K S E A
Sinope
Angora
Trapezus (Trebizond)
Araxes R.
CASPIAN SEA
Oxus R.
Sogd
Samarcand
KHORASMIA
KHORASAN
Balkh
R. Indus
HINDOSTAN
Thebarnes
Edessa
Antioch
Aleppo
Sinveh
IRAK AJEMI
MESOPOTAMIA
Tigris R.
Euphrates R.
Bagdad
Ctesiphon
Cufa
IRAK ARABI
Infahan
Yezd
FARS
KERMAN
Moultan
Bussorah
Shiraz
S I N D
Hejaz
Medina
Nejd
Mecca
Oman
Muscat
Hamyarites
Hadramaut
Greenwich
40
45
50
55
60
40
35
30
20
15
10
5

of a recently invented combustible compound, called *marine fire* (Greek fire), saved the capital for several centuries longer to the Christian world.

This check that the Saracens received before Constantinople was doubtless next in importance for European civilization to the check given their conquering hordes a little later in France, at the great battle of Tours.

90. The Conquest of Spain (711). — While the Moslems were thus being repulsed from Europe at its eastern extremity, the gates of the continent were opened to them by treachery [11] at the western, and they gained a foothold in Spain. At the great battle of Xeres (711), Roderic, the last of the Visigothic kings (par. 17), was hopelessly defeated, and all the peninsula, save some mountainous regions in the northwest, quickly submitted to the invaders.

What the Roman legions had with difficulty effected only after two hundred years' hard fighting, the lieutenants of the caliphs accomplished in the space of a few months. By this conquest some of the fairest provinces of Spain were lost to Christendom for a period of eight hundred years (par. 219).

No sooner had the subjugation of the country been effected than multitudes of colonists from Arabia, Syria, and North Africa crowded into the peninsula, until in a short time the provinces of Seville, Cordova, Toledo, and Granada became predominantly Arabic in dress, manners, language, and religion.

91. Invasion of France; Battle of Tours (732). — Four or five years after the conquest of Spain the Saracens crossed the Pyrenees and established themselves upon the plains of Gaul. This advance of the Moslem hosts beyond the northern wall of Spain was viewed with the greatest alarm by all Christendom. It looked as though the followers of Mohammed would

[11] Count Julian, a Gothic noble who had been intrusted with the command of the important fortress of Ceuta, which guarded the Straits of Gibraltar, was the Judas who, tradition says, in revenge for some real or fancied wrong, betrayed his country into the hands of the Mohammedans.

soon possess all the continent. As Draper pictures it, the Crescent, lying in a vast semicircle upon the northern shore of Africa and the curving coast of Asia, with one horn touching the Bosporus and the other the Straits of Gibraltar, seemed about to round to the full and overspread all Europe.

In the year 732, exactly one hundred years after the death of Mohammed, the Franks, under their able leader Charles (par. 20), and their allies met the Moslems upon the plains of Tours in the center of Gaul, and committed to the issue of a single battle the fate of Christendom and the future course of history. The desperate valor displayed by the warriors of both armies was worthy of the prize at stake. Abderrahman, the Mohammedan leader, fell in the thick of the fight, and night saw the complete discomfiture of the Moslem hordes. The loss that the sturdy blows of the Germans had inflicted upon them was enormous, the accounts of that age swelling the number killed to the impossible figures of 375,000. The disaster, at all events, was so overwhelming that the Saracens lost hope of extending their conquests farther into Gaul, and gradually withdrew behind the Pyrenees.

The young Christian civilization of Western Europe was thus delivered from an appalling danger, such as had not threatened it since the fearful days of Attila and the Huns.

92. Beginning of the Dynasty of the Abbassides (750). — Only eighteen years after the battle of Tours an important event marked the internal history of the caliphate. This was the overthrow of the house of the Ommeiades and the establishment of that of the Abbassides.

We have already seen how the setting up of the Ommeiade throne was accompanied by the proscription and murder of the sons of Ali, the rights of whose family were maintained by a large party among the Moslems (par. 87). The adherents of this house were especially numerous in Persia, and it was that country which finally became the center of a revolt *against the Ommeiades*. The revolutionists proclaimed as

caliph Abdallah, a descendant of Abbas, uncle of Mohammed. The movement was successful; the Ommeiades were proscribed and massacred, and Abdallah became the founder of the celebrated house of the Abbassides, so called from the new caliph's progenitor.

Refusing to reign in the city of Damascus because of its pollution by the Ommeiade usurpers, the new family soon after coming to power established the seat of the royal residence on the lower Tigris, and upon the banks of that river founded the renowned city of Bagdad (762), which was destined to remain the abode of the Abbasside caliphs for a period of five hundred years, — until the subversion of the house by the Tartars of the North.

93. The Golden Age of the Caliphate. — By the time that the foundations of Bagdad were laid, the successors of Mohammed had quite forgotten the rude simplicity that characterized the court of Medina, and had become as luxurious in habits and tastes as the effeminate Greeks and Persians whom they had subjugated. Hence the new capital rose splendid as an Oriental dream. Gorgeous palaces, splendid mosques, and stately public buildings of every kind told of the influence upon the Arabs of the arts of the conquered peoples.

The golden age of the caliphate of Bagdad covered the latter part of the eighth and the ninth century of our era, and was illustrated by the reigns of such princes as Al-Mansur (754–775) and the renowned Harun-al-Raschid (786–809). During this period science and philosophy and literature were most assiduously cultivated by the Arabian scholars, and the court of the caliphs presented in culture and luxury a striking contrast to the rude and barbarous courts of the kings and princes of Western Christendom.

94. The Dismemberment of the Caliphate. — "At the close of the first century of the Hegira," writes Gibbon, "the caliphs were the most potent and absolute monarchs of the globe. The word that went forth from the palace at Damascus

was obeyed on the Indus, on the Jaxartes, and on the Tagus." Scarcely less potent was the word that at first went forth from Bagdad. But in a short time the extended empire of the Abbassides, through the quarrels of sectaries and the ambitions of rival aspirants for the honors of the caliphate, was broken in fragments, and the authority of the rulers of Bagdad finally reduced to the merest shadow.

In the proscription and slaughter of the unfortunate family of the Ommeiades two or three members of the house had escaped. One of these, a youth by the name of Abderrahman, fled to Egypt, and thence made his way along the African coast to Spain, where he was received with acclamation by the Moslems, who declared themselves independent of the Abbassides, and proclaimed the fugitive Emir[12] of Cordova (755). Thus was the Mohammedan world rent in twain.

Besides the parties of the Ommeiades and the Abbassides a third afterwards arose, which, however, never acquired the renown of either of the other two, nor maintained itself so long. These sectaries were the Fatimites. They took their name from Fatima (the daughter of Mohammed and wife of Ali), whose descendants were held by them to be the rightful successors to the authority of the apostle. Having obtained a foothold in Northern Africa, they gradually extended their authority, until in the year 969 they wrested Egypt from the hands of the Abbassides of Bagdad, and founded Cairo, upon the Nile, as their capital. Palestine, a large part of Syria, and the islands of Sardinia and Sicily were afterwards added to their dominions.

So now the empire of the Saracens was divided into three parts, and from three capitals — from Bagdad upon the Tigris, from Cairo upon the Nile, and from Cordova upon the Guadalquivir — were issued the commands of three rival caliphs, each of whom was regarded by his adherents as the sole rightful

[12] The title of "caliph" was not assumed by the Moslem rulers of Spain until *the time of Abderrahman III (912–961).*

spiritual and civil successor of the apostle. All, however, held the great Arabian prophet in the same reverence, all maintained with equal zeal the sacred character of the Koran, and all prayed with their faces turned toward the holy city of Mecca.

95. Spread of the Religion and Language of the Arabs. — Just as the Romans Romanized the peoples they conquered, so did the Saracens Saracenize the populations of the countries subjected to their authority. Over a large part of Spain, over North Africa, Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Persia, Northern India, and portions of Central Asia, were spread — to the more or less perfect exclusion of native customs, speech, and worship — the manners, the language, and the religion of the Arabian conquerors.[18]

In Arabia no religion was tolerated save the faith of the Koran. But in all the countries beyond the limits of the peninsula, freedom of worship was allowed (save to *idolaters*, who were to be "rooted out"), yet unbelievers must purchase this liberty by the payment of a moderate tribute. Thus throughout all the conquered countries, Christians, Jews, and Fire-worshipers were alike granted the privilege of retaining the faith of their fathers. In some cases a part of the churches of the Christians were taken away from them, as the legitimate spoils of conquest, and converted into mosques.

But notwithstanding the toleration granted these several faiths, the Christian and Zoroastrian religions — but not the Jewish — gradually died out almost everywhere throughout the domains of the caliphs.[14] The African Church, which had given birth to a Cyprian and an Augustine, and which for centuries preceding the Saracen conquest had been most

[18] Beyond the eastern edge of Mesopotamia the Arabs failed to impress their language upon the subjected peoples, or in any way, save in the matter of creed, to leave upon them any important permanent trace of their conquests.

[14] Conversions to the Moslem faith were accelerated by that policy of the conquerors which at first gave a pension to every Moslem, together with exemption from poll and land taxes.

powerful in wealth, learning, and followers, gradually fell away, until by the beginning of the thirteenth century there probably was not a single church upon the shores of Northern Africa.

In Spain, in the provinces of Cordova, Seville, Valencia, and Granada, Islam became the predominant faith. In Syria and Mesopotamia the Nestorian and Jacobite churches maintained only a feeble foothold. In Persia the fires of the fire-worshipers, after languishing for several centuries, finally expired, save at Yezd, where a few followers of the old worship still fed the sacred flames, and Islam became the prevalent creed throughout the ancient home of the faith of Zoroaster.[15] In Northern India Mohammedanism obtained a strong foothold, which it has retained to the present day, although it never became there the dominant religion; while among the Tartar tribes about the Oxus and Jaxartes the creed of the prophet was embraced to the virtual exclusion of all ancient forms of idolatry.

96. The Civilization of Arabian Islam.[16] — The Saracens were co-heirs of antiquity with the Germans. The Germans received and transmitted to later times particularly the literary, philosophical, and legal treasures of the Hebrew and Græco-Roman cultures, while the Arabs made especially their own the scientific[17] accumulations of the ancient civilizations and bequeathed them to Christian Europe. These elements of civilization they added to and enriched, and in several of the

[15] The number of Guebers, or fire-worshipers, in Persia at the present time is about 100,000, found for the most part at Yezd and in the province of Kerman. A larger number may be counted in Western India, the descendants of the Guebers who fled from Persia at the time of the Arabian invasion. They are there called Parsees, from the land whence they came. After the English, they are the most enterprising, intelligent, and influential class in India to-day. They are more like Europeans than any other Asiatic people.

[16] Kremer's *Culturgeschichte des Orients unter den Chalifen*, chaps. vii and ix.

[17] Gibbon affirms that no Greek poet, orator, or historian was ever translated *into Arabic. See Decline and Fall*, chap. lii.

countries of which they took possession, especially in Babylonia and in Spain, developed a civilization which in some respects far surpassed any that the world had yet seen.

In the arrangements of their court, the organization of their army, and the administration of their government the Arabs imitated the Persians or the Byzantine Greeks. Their government was an absolute monarchy, such as has always been the favorite form of government among Oriental peoples. Since in the Mohammedan state the temporal and the spiritual power are united in the same hands, the caliph was the high priest, the judge, and the ruler of the nation. The most important officer beneath the caliph was the vizier, or prime minister, who, when the caliph chanced to be weak or inefficient, became the virtual head of the government and the real source of patronage and power.

The Moslem law system, the basis of which is found in the Koran, was the most original creation of the Arab mind. After the Roman law, it is probably the most influential and widely obeyed system of laws and regulations that any race or civilization has developed. Since the system embraces religious as well as civil matters, it is in some respects like the Mosaic code, from which it liberally borrowed. It deals with all kinds of subjects and relations, ranging from prayer and pilgrimages to contracts and inheritances.

In Arabia and in all the countries of which the Arabs had made themselves masters, there had been carried on from time immemorial the chief industrial arts. The establishment of the wide empire of the caliphs quickened this industrial life, and caused all these arts to be carried to a state of perfection that was not surpassed until the great industrial inventions and improvements of our own day.

Commerce and trade also assumed a fresh activity and a new importance. The Arabs in Babylonia and in Syria became the heirs and successors of the ancient Chaldæans and the Phœnicians, and recreated that commercial activity

of the earlier time that nourished the great cities of Babylon, Tyre, and Sidon. As in the *Odyssey* of Homer we have a mirror of the commercial activity and the adventurous trade voyages of the early maritime Greeks, so in the marvelous stories of *Sindbad the Sailor* we have a like mirror of the voyages and adventures of the Arabian sailors.

The great intellectual activity that characterized the earlier centuries of Arabian Islam resulted, at least in part, from the study of the Koran, just as in the Christian West the intellectual life of the mediæval ages was at first quickened by the study of the Bible. Thus the sciences of grammar, rhetoric, lexicography, theology, and jurisprudence grew up out of the study and interpretation of the words of the sacred book.

Alongside these studies, historical and biographical writings naturally took an important place. The need of preserving in their original form the sayings of Mohammed and the traditions of his life, as well as the desire to transmit to posterity the story of the wonderful conquests and exploits of the founders of the Arabian empire, inspired and encouraged the writing of biography and history. In both fields the early centuries of Arabian Islam produced many illustrious names.

In the lighter forms of literature — romance and poetry — the Arabs produced much that possesses a high degree of excellence. In the field of romance they followed the Persian story-tellers. The inimitable tales of the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*, besides being a valuable commentary on Arabian life and manners at the time of the culmination of Oriental culture at the court of Bagdad, forms also an addition to the imperishable portion of the literature of the world. The poetry of the Arabs was wholly original. It was the natural and beautiful expression of the Arabian genius and temperament.

The physical sciences were also pursued by the Arabian scholars with great eagerness and with considerable success. *Geography was* forced upon their attention by their wide

conquests and their extended trade relations. From the Greeks and the Hindus they received the germs of astronomy, geometry, arithmetic, algebra, medicine, botany, and other sciences. The scientific writings of Aristotle, Euclid, and Galen, and Hindu treatises on astronomy and algebra were translated from the Greek and Sanskrit into Arabic and formed the basis of the Arabian studies and investigations. Almost all of the sciences that thus came into their hands were improved and enriched by them, and then transmitted to European scholars.[18] They made medicine for the first time a true science. They devised what is known from them as the Arabic or decimal system of notation,[19] and gave to Europe this indispensable instrument of all scientific investigations dependent upon mathematical calculations. In chemistry they never advanced beyond alchemy, but in their experiments as alchemists they discovered the existence and nature of several of the chemical elements and thus laid the basis of modern chemistry. Their astronomical knowledge is indicated by their successful measurement of a degree of a great circle of the earth, and their calculation of the obliquity of the ecliptic and the precession of the equinoxes.

All this literary and scientific activity naturally found expression in the establishment of schools, universities, and libraries. In all the great cities of the Arabian empire, as at Bagdad, Cairo, and Cordova, centuries before Europe could boast anything beyond cathedral or monastic schools, great universities were drawing together vast crowds of eager young Moslems

[18] What Europe received in science from Arabian sources is kept in remembrance by such words as *alchemy*, *alcohol*, *alembic*, *algebra*, *alkali*, *almanac*, *azimuth*, *chemistry*, *elixir*, *zenith*, and *nadir*. To how great an extent the chief Arabian cities became the manufacturing centers of the mediæval world is indicated by the names which these places have given to various textile fabrics and other articles. Thus *muslin* comes from Mosul, on the Tigris, *damask* from Damascus, and *gauze* from Gaza. Damascus and Toledo blades tell of the proficiency of the Arab workmen in metallurgy.

[19] The figures or numerals, with the exception of the zero symbol, employed in their system, they seem to have borrowed from India.

and creating an atmosphere of learning and refinement. The famous university at Cairo, which has at the present day an attendance of several thousand students, is a survival from the great days of Arabian Islam.

In the erection of mosques and other public edifices the Arab architects developed a new and striking style of architecture, — one of the most beautiful specimens of which is preserved to us in the palace of the Moorish kings at Granada, — a style which has given to modern builders some of their finest models and most fruitful motives.

97. The Evil and the Good in Islam. — The first-fruits of Islam might well lead one to regard it as a faith conducive to civilization; but in many of its teachings and inherited institutions it is a system unfavorable to individual development and social progress.

In opposition to Christianity, Islam tolerates polygamy [20] and places no restraint upon divorce,[21] thus destroying the sacredness of family life. It also gives a religious sanction to the institutions of the harem and the zenana, thereby creating a vitiated atmosphere for Moslem children and depriving all classes alike of the elevating and refining influences of true social intercourse.

Further, Islam in authorizing the faithful to make slaves of their captives in holy wars, legalizes slavery; Mohammedan countries are the main strongholds of slavery at the present time. It also fosters religious intolerance; the Moslem is forbidden by his religion to grant equality to unbelievers. Again, it unites in the same hands both religious and civil authority and thereby creates despotism.

Still another most serious defect of Islam is found in the immutable character of its system of laws. All the enactments

[20] The Koran (sura iv, 3) allows the believer to take "two, or three, or four wives, and not more." By a special dispensation (sura xxxiii, 49) Mohammed was allowed to take a larger, and seemingly indefinite, number. At one time the *prophet had ten wives.* [21] Sura ii, 229, 230.

and judicial decisions of Mohammed and of the first four caliphs are regarded as binding, at least in spirit, for all time. Since the system, as we have learned (par. 96), covers the civil as well as the religious sphere, Mohammedan law has been prevented from adapting itself to the changing needs of society. This is doubtless one cause of the unprogressive character of Mohammedan society as contrasted with the progressive civilization of the Western races, who were the fortunate inheritors of the admirable secular, and therefore flexible, system of the Roman law.

Islam, however, inculcates some inspiring truths and recommends some great virtues. Like Christianity it teaches the unity of God, immortality, and retributive rewards and punishments after death. These doctrines render it immeasurably superior to fetichism or to polytheism, and have made it a great force for the uplift of multitudes of idolatrous tribes in Asia and Africa.

Among the leading virtues inculcated by Islam is that of temperance. The Koran forbids positively to the believer the use of wine and inferentially of all strong drinks.[22] To this prohibition is attributable the fact that drunkenness is less common and open in Mohammedan than in Christian lands.

Finally, in forming our estimate of Islam we should carefully bear in mind that the religion as held and practiced by the different Mohammedan races to-day, particularly by the Ottoman Turks, is a very degenerate form of the Islamic faith when compared with that held and practiced by the Arabs, the people among whom it first arose. Mohammedanism, like Christianity, was at its best in what we may call its Apostolic Age.

Sources and Source Material. — *The Koran.* The translation by Palmer, in "Sacred Books of the East" series, is the best. That by Sale is now antiquated. The translation in meter by Rodwell conveys some idea of the literary merits of the original. This version is also

[22] Sura v, 92.

valuable on account of the chronological arrangement of the suras, or chapters. The Koran, like the Bible for Christianity, is our chief source for a knowledge of Islam as a religion. *The Speeches and Table-Talk of the Prophet Mohammed* (chosen and translated by Stanley Lane-Poole). *The Bible*, Ezekiel, chap. xxvii; for a striking picture of the old Oriental trade and caravan routes in which the Arabians were largely interested. *The Arabian Nights' Entertainments* (translated by Edward Forster; revised ed., New York, 1895). For the breath and aroma of the Orient. *European History Studies* (Univ. of Nebraska), vol. ii, No. 3, "Selections from the Koran."

Secondary or Modern Works. — MUIR (W.), *The Corân: Its Composition and Teachings; The Life of Mohammed*, 4 vols. (3d ed. in 1 vol.); *Annals of the Early Caliphate;* and *The Rise and Decline of Islam.* All these works are based on the original sources; they are, however, written in an unfriendly and unsympathetic spirit. SMITH (R. B.), **Mohammed and Mohammedanism.* Written in an attractive style. Has a short bibliography. DEUTSCH (E.), *Literary Remains.* Contains the important essay entitled "Islam." This same essay also forms an appendix to the preceding work by Smith. SPRENGER (A.), *The Life of Mohammed* (Allahabad, 1851). IRVING (W.), **Mahomet and his Successors* (numerous editions). GIBBON (E.), *Decline and Fall*, chaps. l–lii. Still valuable. CARLYLE (T.), **Heroes and Hero-Worship*, lect. ii, "The Hero as Prophet." Bracing reading. STANLEY (A. P.), *History of the Eastern Church.* Read lecture entitled "Mohammedanism in its Relations to the Eastern Church." SCHAFF (P.), *History of the Christian Church*, vol. iv, chap. iii, pp. 143–202, "Mohammedanism in its Relations to Christianity." FREEMAN (E. A.), **History and Conquests of the Saracens* (2d ed., London, 1876). A rapid sketch by a master. GILMAN (A.), *The Saracens from the Earliest Times to the Fall of Bagdad* (Story of the Nations). Contains a list of over two hundred books bearing on the subject, with short appreciations of the most important works. SYED AMEER ALI, *The Spirit of Islam: or the Life and Teachings of Mohammed* (2d ed., London, 1896). By a Mohammedan barrister-at-law. The writer maintains that Islam, as is insisted upon by Christians for Christianity, should be judged by its spirit, and not by the practice of its professors. Also the same author's *Short History of the Saracens.* POOLE (S. L.), *Studies in a Mosque.* SMITH (H. P.), *The Bible in Islam*, chap. x, "Church and State"; for Mohammed's position at Medina. The articles by Wellhausen, Nöldeke, and Guyard, under the word *Mohammedanism* in the Encyc. Brit., have a very special value. MILMAN (H. H.), *History of Latin Christianity*, vol. ii, bk. iv, chaps. i *and ii.*

CHAPTER VII

CHARLES THE GREAT AND THE RESTORATION OF THE EMPIRE IN THE WEST

98. General Remarks. — In the foregoing chapter we traced the rise and decline of the power of the Saracens. We saw the Semitic East roused for a moment to a life of tremendous energy by the miracle of religious enthusiasm, and then beheld it sinking rapidly again into inaction and weakness, disappointing all its early promises. Manifestly the Law is not to go forth from Mecca. The Semitic race is not to lead the civilization of the world.

But returning again to the West, we discover among the Teutonic barbarians indications of such youthful energy and life, that we are at once persuaded that to them have been given the future time and the world. The Franks, who, with the aid of their confederates, withstood the advance of the Saracens upon the field of Tours, and saved Europe from subjection to the Koran (par. 91), are the people that first attract our attention. Among them it is that a man appears who makes the first notable attempt, after that of Theodoric the Ostrogoth, to restore peace and order in society and reëstablish civilization. Charlemagne, or Charles the Great, their king, is the imposing figure that moves amidst all the events of the time; indeed, is the one who makes the events, and renders the period in which he lived an epoch in universal history.

The story of this era affords the key to very much of the subsequent history of Western Europe. The mere enumeration of the events which are to claim our attention will illustrate the *important* and germinal character of the period. We

shall tell how the mayors of the palace of the Merovingian princes became the actual kings of the Franks; how, through the help of the Frankish kings, the popes laid the foundations of their temporal sovereignty; and how Charles the Great became the head of the restored empire in the West, and throughout its extended limits laid the basis of modern civilization.

As we have already pointed out (par. 28), it was the early and fortunate alliance entered into by the kings of the Franks with the Catholic Church that was one main cause of their marvelous good fortune and of their final ascendency in Western Europe.

99. How Duke Pippin became King of the Franks (751).— Charles Martel, whom we have already met on the memorable field of Tours (par. 20), although the most prominent personage of his time, was, as we have learned, nominally only an officer of the Frankish court. With the title of Mayor of the Palace, he administered the government in the name of a series of weak Merovingian sovereigns, whom he set up one after another, leaving long gaps between their nominal reigns. It would have been easy, we should suppose, for the powerful duke to have taken into his own hands the supreme power, but, constrained probably by motives of policy, he never assumed the title of king.

But Charles's son, Pippin,[1] aspired to the royal title and honors. The way in which he set about to secure the prize illustrates at once the reverence in which the kingly name was held, and the influence of the Church in these barbarous times. In concurrence with the nobles of the realm, Pippin sent to Pope Zacharias at Rome ambassadors who represented things to him in such a way as to imply that it was the wish of the Franks that the Merovingian king should be deposed, and that the duke, whose own deeds, together with those of his

[1] *Two sons* of Charles Martel, Carloman and Pippin, succeeded to his authority; *but Carloman soon* resigned his office and became a monk.

illustrious father, had done so much for the Frankish nation and for Christendom, and who wielded all the power of royalty, should be invested with the symbols and titles of the kingly office.

Zacharias, anxious to make Pippin his friend, since he needed help against the Lombards, gave implied approval to the proposed scheme by replying that it seemed altogether reasonable that the one who was king in power should be king also in name. This was sufficient. Childeric — such was the name of the Merovingian king — was straightway deposed; his long hair and beard, the symbol of Merovingian royalty, were cut off; and then he was placed in a monastery. Behind the walls of the cloister the last of the long-haired kings of the Franks is lost to history. Pippin, in the name of the pope, was anointed by the missionary bishop Boniface as king of the Franks (751). In this way he became the founder of a new royal race, known as the Carolingian from his illustrious son, Charles the Great.

The part taken by the pope in this important matter of the deposition of the Merovingian king, and the exalting of the dukes of Austrasia to the royal dignity, was afterwards magnified and made a precedent which subsequent bishops of Rome quoted with effect when endeavoring to establish their claim to the right of deposing for heresy or misrule the temporal princes of the earth.

100. Pippin helps to establish the Temporal Power of the Popes (756). — Pippin had inherited the talent and ambition of his father, and during his vigorous reign (751–768) widened the boundaries of the Frankish realm and raised the aspiring Carolingian house to still higher distinction. The most important transactions of his reign are connected with the affairs of Italy and the papacy.

In the year 753 Pope Stephen II, who was troubled by the king of the Lombards (Aistulf), made a long and dangerous journey to the court of Pippin, and besought his aid against

the barbarian. Pippin, quick to return the favor which the head of the Church had rendered him in the securing of his crown, straightway interposed in behalf of the pope. His appearance with an army in Italy caused the king of the Lombards to promise to return to the pope "all that was due him"; but Pippin had hardly reached home again before the treacherous Lombard, instead of restoring to the Roman see what he had taken from it, was besieging Rome. A second time Pippin, stirred by urgent letters from the pope, crossed the Alps with his army, expelled the Lombards from their recent conquests, and made a donation to the pope of the regained lands [2] (756). As a symbol of the gift he laid the keys of Ravenna, Rimini, and of many other cities on the tomb of Saint Peter.

This endowment may be regarded as having practically laid the basis of the temporal sovereignty of the popes; for although Pope Stephen may have already resolved to cast off allegiance to the Eastern emperor and set up an independent Church state,[3] still it is not probable that he could have carried out successfully such an enterprise had he not been aided in his project by the Frankish king.

The entrance of the Roman bishops among the secular princes of the peninsula had most disastrous consequences for Italy. It caused them to become the determined foes of an Italian monarchy, since they foresaw that the formation of a united Italy meant the loss of their temporal power — the actual outcome of the unification of Italy in our own day.

101. Accession of Charles the Great; his Wars. — Pippin died in the year 768, and his kingdom passed into the hands of his two sons, Carloman and Charles, the latter being better known by the name he achieved of "Charlemagne," or

[2] These lands thus donated to the pope embraced lands that the Lombard king had wrested from the exarchate as well as from the pope. The sovereignty of all these belonged nominally to the emperor at Constantinople. His claims were ignored by Pippin.

[3] See W. Sickel, *Kirchenstaat und Karolinger*, in the *Historische Zeitschrift for 1900 (Bd. 84, pp. 385–409)*.

EUROPE
IN THE TIME OF
CHARLES THE GREAT
814.
ORKNEY IS.
SHETLAND IS.
THE HEBRIDES
IONA
Lindisfarne
Tees R.
Whitby
York
Humber R.
London
Canterbury
Paderborn
New Corbey
AACHEN
(Aix-la-Chapelle)
Frankfurt
BOHEMIA
Verdun
Paris
Chalons
Tours
St.Gall
Geneva
Lyons
Milan
Venice
Ravenna
AQUITANIA
BURGUNDY
BAVARIA
GASCONY
Arles
CANTABRIA
Saragossa
CORSICA
ROME
M.CASSINO
Naples
Salerno
EMIRATE
OF
CORDOVA
Toledo
Tagus R.
Lisbon
SARDINIA
BALEARIC IS.
Seville
CORDOVA
Granada
Guadiana R.
Guadalquivir R.
Xeres
Cadiz
Ceuta
Strait of Gibraltar
Tangier
MOROCCO
Palermo
Carthage
SICILY
Syracuse
Kalrouan
MALTA
Tripoli
Roman R
Roman E
and its d

N
S
Novgorod
Kief
Dniepr R.
Turks or Magyars
Danube R.
Cherson
CONSTANTINOPLE
Philippopolis
Hadrianople
Nicomedia
Nicea
BITHYNIA
Dorylæum
PHRYGIA
Philadelphia
Iconium
Trapezus (Trebisond)
Araxes R.
Edessa
Nineveh
Tigris
MESOPOTAMIA
Antioch
Aleppo
RHODES
CYPRUS
CRETE
Berytus
Sidon
Tyre
Ptolemais (Acre)
Damascus
Tiberias
Nazareth
Jaffa
Jerusalem
Ascalon
Pelusium
Cæsarea
Gaza
Alexandria
BAGDAD
Ctesiphon
Cufa
Euphrates
Western Caliphate
Eastern Caliphate
Medina
Mecca

Charles the Great. Three years after the accession of the brothers, Carloman died, and Charles took possession of his dominions.

Charles's long reign of nearly half a century — he ruled forty-six years — was filled with military expeditions and conquests, by which he so extended the boundaries of his dominions that at his death they embraced the larger part of Western Europe. He made fifty-two military campaigns, the chief of which were against the Lombards, the Saracens, the Saxons, and the Avars. Of these we shall speak briefly.

Among the first undertakings of Charles was a campaign against the Lombards, whose king, Desiderius, a bitter enemy of the Frankish monarch, had given an asylum to the widow of Carloman, and had asked Pope Adrian to anoint her infant son as the successor of his father. The pope refusing to comply with his request, Desiderius threatened to seize his territory, and was proceeding to carry out his threat, when Adrian appealed for aid to his friend Charles. The king at once marched into Italy, wrested from Desiderius all his possessions, shut up the unfortunate king in a monastery, and placed on his own head the famous iron crown of the Lombards (par. 21). While in Italy he visited Rome, and in return for the favor of the pope, confirmed the donation of his father, Pippin (774).

In the year 778 Charles gathered his warriors for a crusade against the Mohammedan Moors in Spain. He crossed the Pyrenees and succeeded in winning from the Moslems all the northeastern corner of the peninsula. These lands thus regained for Christendom he made a part of his empire, under the title of the Spanish March. As Charles was leading his victorious bands back across the Pyrenees, the rear of his army, while hemmed in by the walls of the Pass of Roncesvalles, was set upon by the wild mountaineers (the Gascons) and cut to pieces before he could give relief. Of the details of this event no authentic account has been preserved; but long afterwards, associated with the fabulous deeds of the hero

Roland, it formed a favorite theme of the tales and songs of the Trouveurs of Northern France (par. 350).

But by far the greater number of the campaigns of Charles were directed against the pagan Saxons, who almost alone of the German tribes still retained their ancient paganism. The Saxons were fighting not only for their homes but for their religion; for the establishment of Christianity among them was one of Charles's objects in attempting their subjugation.

Reduced to submission again and again, as often did they rise in desperate revolt. The heroic Witikind was the "second Arminius" who encouraged his countrymen to resist to the last the intruders upon their soil. Finally Charles, angered beyond measure by the obstinacy of the barbarians in refusing to accept him as their sovereign and Christianity as their religion, caused forty-five hundred prisoners in his hands to be beheaded in revenge for the contumacy of the nation.[4] Witikind at last yielded, threw himself upon the mercy of Charles, was kindly treated, received the sacrament of baptism, and, if we may believe tradition, ended his life in a monastery. Many of his countrymen fled across the sea to Scandinavia, and their descendants — such is the retribution in events — helped to man the ships of the Vikings, the commencement of whose depredations on his subjects Charles himself, according to tradition, lived to lament (par. 125).

To the east and the southeast, behind the German tribes which Charles had reduced to obedience, were heathen Slavs and Tartars. Among the latter were the Avars, a race terrible as the Huns of Attila, and an offshoot seemingly of the same stock. These savage folk, now established in the ancient Pannonia, were distressing the Bavarians, subjects of Charles.

[4] The so-called massacre of Verden (782). The attempt of the German scholar Ulmann to prove the transmitted account of this massacre to be unhistorical cannot be regarded as successful.

In a series of campaigns (790–805) Charles broke their power, destroyed their so-called "Great Ring," a sort of royal camp and stronghold, — securing here enormous spoils which the barbarians had collected in their various marauding expeditions, — and reduced the race to a tributary condition. This subjugation of the Avars was one of the greatest services that Charles rendered the young Christian civilization of Europe. For three centuries they had been the scourge of all their neighbors.

102. Restoration of the Empire in the West (800). — An event of seemingly little real moment, yet, in its influence upon succeeding affairs, of the very greatest importance, now claims our attention. Pope Leo III having called upon Charles for aid against a hostile faction at Rome, the king soon appeared in person at the capital, and punished summarily the disturbers of the peace of the Church. The gratitude of Leo led him at this time to make a most signal return for the many services of the Frankish king. To understand his act a word of explanation is needed.

For a considerable time a variety of circumstances had been fostering a growing feeling of enmity between the Italians and the emperors at Constantinople. Disputes had arisen between the Church of the East and that of the West, and the Byzantine rulers had endeavored to compel the Latin Church to introduce certain changes and reforms in its worship, — which thing had aroused the most determined opposition of the Roman bishops. They denounced the Eastern emperors as schismatics and heretics, and upbraided them with having allowed the Christian lands of the East, while they were preoccupied in a wicked persecution of the orthodox Church of the West, to fall a prey to the Arabian infidels.

Just at this time, moreover, by the crime of the Empress Irene, who had deposed her son Constantine VI, and put out his eyes, that she might have his place, the Byzantine throne was vacant, in the estimation of the Italians, who contended

that the crown of the Cæsars could not be worn by a woman. In view of these circumstances it was natural that Pope Leo and those about him should have conceived the purpose of taking away from the heretical and effeminate Greeks the imperial crown, and bestowing it upon some strong and orthodox and worthy prince in the West.

Now, among all the Teutonic chiefs of Western Christendom, there was none who could dispute in claims to the honor with the king of the Franks, the representative of a most illustrious house, and the strongest champion of the young Christianity of the West against her pagan foes. Accordingly, as Charles was participating in the solemnities of Christmas Day in the Church of Saint Peter at Rome, the pope approached the kneeling king, and placing a crown of gold upon his head, proclaimed him Emperor and Augustus[5] (800).

The intention of Pope Leo was, by a sort of reversal of the act of Constantine the Great, to bring back from the East the seat of the imperial court; but what he really accomplished was a restoration of the line of emperors in the West, which 324 years before had been ended by Odovacar, when he dethroned Romulus Augustulus and sent the royal vestments to Constantinople. We say this was what he actually effected; for the Greeks of the East, disregarding wholly what the Roman people and the pope had done, maintained their line of emperors just as though nothing had occurred in Italy. So now from this time on for centuries there were, most of the

[5] Einhard says that Charles was not aware of the intention of the pope, and that had he been, he would not have gone into Saint Peter's that day. Until recently this has generally been interpreted as simply meaning that Charles was averse to having the imperial crown bestowed in just the way it was, it having been assumed that he really desired the title of Emperor, but would perhaps have preferred to place the crown on his head with his own hands, as Napoleon did a thousand years later, and thus not seem to be beholden to any one for it. But many scholars are now inclined to the opinion that Einhard's words mean precisely what they say, and that Charles did not desire the titles of Emperor *and Augustus. In* the view of these scholars the restoration of the empire was *actually the work of the pope* and his party.

time, two emperors, one in the East and another in the West, each claiming to be the rightful successor of Cæsar Augustus, and each upon occasion denouncing the other as a pretender and an impostor.[6]

The domains over which Charles ruled with imperial authority were quite as ample as those embraced within the most extended limits of the old Roman empire in the West. Africa and almost all of Spain were, indeed, in the hands of the Saracens, and Britain was held by the Saxons; but almost all of Italy, modern France, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Germany, and much of what is now Austria-Hungary obeyed his commands, and their numerous and varied tribes and peoples swore fealty to him as emperor.

103. Charles the Great as a Ruler. — Charles the Great must not be regarded as a warrior merely. His most noteworthy work was that which he effected as a legislator and administrator. In this field, too, were exhibited the finer qualities of his masterful personality. In building up his great empire Charles practiced much cruelty and unrighteousness, but over this empire, once established, he ruled with the constant solicitude of a father.

[6] From this time on it will be proper for us to use the terms *Western* empire and *Eastern* empire. These names should not, however, be employed before this time, for the two parts of the old Roman empire were simply administrative divisions of a single empire; but we may properly enough speak of the Roman empire *in* the West, and the Roman empire *in* the East, or of the Western and Eastern emperors. What it is very essential to note is, that the restoration of the line of the Western emperors actually destroyed the unity of the old empire, so that from this time on until the destruction of the Eastern empire in 1453, there were, as we have said in the text, two rival emperors, each in theory having rightful suzerainty of the whole world, whereas the two emperors in Roman times were the co-rulers of a single and indivisible World-Empire. See Bryce's *The Holy Roman Empire.*

The line of Western Teutonic emperors was maintained until the nineteenth century, when it was ended by the act of Napoleon in the dismemberment of Germany (in 1806). The Holy Roman Empire, as this Western empire came to be called, played a most important part, as we shall see, in the affairs of mediæval Europe. It was, indeed, scarcely more than a name; but then there is often very much *in a name.*

For the purposes of government, Charles, following the model afforded by the lands of the old Merovingian kingdom, laid off his vast dominions into administrative districts, known as counties, at the head of each of which was placed a governor bearing the title of Count. It is important that we should notice carefully this governmental system, for embedded in it lay the germs of Feudalism (par. 144).

Among the characteristic institutions of the empire was the Diet, or General Assembly, a survival manifestly of the old Teutonic folk-moot (par. 10). This body held a meeting every year in the spring.[7] At these gatherings there took place merely an interchange of views between Charles and the assembled freemen of the realm; for the Diet was not a legislative body. Its functions were confined to giving the emperor advice and information. Its relation to Charles is well shown by the words with which he is represented as having once addressed one of its meetings: "Counsel me," he said, "that I may know what to do."

In connection with the General Assembly we should notice the celebrated Capitularies of Charles. These were not laws proper, but collections of decrees, decisions, and instructions covering matters of every kind, civil and religious, public and domestic. Some of them were drawn up with the concurrence of the Diet; a greater number embodied simply Charles's own ideas of what his chiefs or his subjects needed in the way of advice, suggestion, or command.

Another noteworthy feature of the government of Charles was the itinerant commissioners (*missi dominici*) whose duty it was to visit at stated intervals all parts of a given circuit, observe how the local magistrates were discharging their several duties, correct what was wrong, and report to the emperor all matters of which he should be informed. This was an admirable device for putting the head of the vast

[7] *In the autumn there* gathered a second smaller assembly, or council, which *was composed solely of the* magnates of the empire and the chief royal advisers.

empire in close and almost personal touch with all its parts near and remote.

Charles, particularly after his coronation as emperor, exercised as careful a superintendence over religious as over civil affairs. He called synods or councils of the clergy of his dominions, presided at these meetings, revised the canons of the Church, and addressed to the abbots and bishops of his empire fatherly words of admonition, reproof, and exhortation.

Education was also a matter to which Charles gave zealous attention. He was himself from first to last as diligent a student as his busy life permitted. His biographer, Einhard, says that he could repeat his prayers as well in Latin as in German, and that he understood Greek, although he had difficulty in its pronunciation. He never ceased to be a learner. In his old age he tried to learn to write, but found that it was too late.

Distressed by the dense ignorance all about him, Charles labored to instruct his subjects, lay and clerical, by the establishment of schools and the multiplication and dissemination of books through the agency of the copyists of the monasteries. He invited from England the celebrated Alcuin, one of the finest scholars of the age, and with his help organized what became known as the Palace School, in which his children and courtiers and he himself were pupils. A rare spirit of comradeship seems to have pervaded this happy school. The different members of it were in pleasantry given Hebrew or classical names. Charles was known as King David; Alcuin as Flaccus; while still others bore the names of Homer, Pindar, Samuel, Columba, and Jeremiah. The lessons, debates, and conversations of the school extended to all matters of intellectual interest, theological and scientific.

A great number of other schools were established by Charles in connection with the cathedrals and monasteries throughout his dominions. Many of these were organized by Alcuin, the one *connected* with the celebrated monastery of Saint

Martin at Tours, of which establishment he was abbot for many years, became under his direction one of the most renowned schools in Europe. Alcuin's influence was unbounded. It is said that almost all the great men of the following generation were disciples and pupils of his.

In causing the establishment of these schools Charles set at work influences that left a deep and permanent impression upon European civilization. They mark the beginning of a new intellectual life for Western Christendom.

104. The Death of Charles (814); his Place in History. — Charles enjoyed the imperial dignity only fourteen years, dying in 814. Einhard in speaking of the event simply says that he was buried on the day of his death within the basilica at Aachen, which he himself had built. A later tradition affirms that the dead monarch was placed upon a throne, with his royal robes about him, his good sword by his side, and a book of the Gospels open on his lap.[8] It seemed as though men could not believe that his reign was over. And it was not.

By the almost universal verdict of students of the mediæval period, Charles the Great has been pronounced the most imposing personage that appears between the fall of Rome and the fifteenth century. "He stands alone," says Hallam, "like a beacon upon a waste, or a rock in the broad ocean." He is the King Arthur of the French — the favorite hero of mediæval minstrelsy. His greatness has erected an enduring monument for itself in his name, the one by which he is best known — Charlemagne.

The fame of his greatness reached as far as the distant court of the caliphs of Bagdad; for Harun-al-Raschid sent him as gifts an elephant, and a curious water-clock, which, with its self-opening doors and moving figures, attested at once, as

[8] This account differs so widely from that of contemporaries of Charles that it cannot be received as historical. Consult Lindner, *Die Fabel von der Bestattung Karls des Grossen;* Mombert, *Charles the Great*, pp. 484–486; and *Hodgkin, Charles the Great*, p. 250.

has been remarked, the friendship of the caliph and the ingenuity of the Arabian artists.

The French form of the name — Charlemagne — under which the Frankish monarch has passed into history has fostered the misconception that he was a French king. But in fact Charles was simply a Teutonic prince, sustaining exactly the same relation to the Latinized inhabitants of the old empire as was held by Theodoric, or Euric, or Clovis. "The coming to power of the Carolingians," writes Freeman, "was almost like a second German conquest of Gaul." "Charles, above all things," says Church, "was a German. He was in language, in ideas, in policy, in tastes, in his favorite dwelling-places, a Teutonic, not a Latin or Latinized king."

105. The Results of his Reign. — Among the many results of the reign of Charles the Great we should take notice of the three following:

First, he did for Germany what Julius Cæsar did for Gaul, — brought this barbarian land within the pale of civilization and made it a part of the new-forming Romano-German world.

Second, through the part he played in the revival of the empire, he helped to give to the following generations "a great political ideal," and to set up an authority among the European princes which was destined to lend character to large sections of mediæval history (chap. xii).

Third, Charles kneaded into something like a homogeneous mass the various racial elements composing the mixed society of the wide regions over which he ruled. Throughout his long and vigorous reign that fusion of Roman and Teuton of which we spoke in a previous chapter went on apace. Charles failed indeed to unite the various races in his vast empire in a permanent political union, but he did much to create among them those religious, intellectual, and social bonds which were never afterwards severed. From his time on, as it has been concisely expressed, there was a Western Christendom.

100. Division of the Empire; the Treaty of Verdun (843). — Like the kingdom of Alexander and that of many another great conqueror, the mighty empire of Charles the Great fell to pieces soon after his death. "His scepter was the bow of Ulysses which could not be drawn by any weaker hand."

The empire had been consolidated by four such men of ability, energy, and genius as seldom succeed one another in the same labor; but with the great Charles the short-lived glory of the house of the Carolingians passed away forever.

Charles was followed by his son Lewis, surnamed the Pious (814–840). He associated with himself in the government his four sons, Lothair, Pippin, Lewis, and Charles, whose quarrels kept the empire in constant turmoil and made bitter the last days of their father.

Upon the death of Lewis I, fierce contention broke out afresh among the surviving princes, and myriads of lives were sacrificed in the unnatural strife.[9] Finally, by the famous Treaty of Verdun (843), the empire was divided as follows: to Lewis was given the part east of the Rhine, the nucleus of the later Germany; to Charles the part west of the Rhone and the Meuse, one day to become France; while to Lothair was reserved the narrow central strip between these, stretching across Europe from the North Sea to the Mediterranean, including the rich lands of the lower Rhine, the valley of the Rhone, and all of Italy. To Lothair also was given the imperial title.

This treaty is celebrated, not only because it was the first great treaty among the European states, but also on account of its marking the divergence from one another, and in some sense the origin of two of the great nations of modern Europe, —Romanic France and Teutonic Germany.

107. The End of the Carolingian Dynasties. — After this dismemberment of the dominions of Charles the Great the

[9] *Pippin* died two years before his father (in 838), and the part of the empire *that had been given to him* was divided between Lothair and Charles.

THE
WESTERN EMPIRE
As Divided at Verdun
843.
Lothar
Lewis
Charles
NORTHUMBERLAND
MERCIA
EAST ANGLIA
WESSEX
R. Eider
Hamburg
Bremen
R. Elbe
Wends
SAXONY
WILZI
R. Oder
Lechs
Czechs
CHROBATIA
Cologne
ANCIENT FRANCIA
AUSTRIA
SORABI
Mainz
Trier
Rheims
Rouen
LAON
Paris
Verdun
Regensburg
Strassburg
NEUSTRIA
BRITTANY
WESTERN FRANCIA
MIDDLE FRANCIA
Le Mans
Angers
R. Loire
Besançon
BAVARIA
CARINTHIA
R. Danube
Geneva
Lyons
Aosta
Milan
Verona
Trieste
Aquileia
Bordeaux
R. Rhone
Genoa
Ravenna
CHROBATIA
GASCONY
Toulouse
CARLES
TUSCANY
SPANISH MARCH
Narbonne
EMIRATE OF CORDOVA
Barcelona
CORSICA
ROME
BENEVENTUM
5
0
5
10
15
20
25
50
45

annals of the different branches of the Carolingian family become intricate, wearisome, and uninstructive. A fate as dark and woeful as that which, according to Grecian story, overhung the royal house of Thebes seemed to brood over the house of Charlemagne. In all its different lines a strange and adverse destiny awaited the lineage of the great king. The tenth century witnessed the extinction of the family.

In France the Carolingian dynasty gave place to the Capetian in 987. By this time the Romano-Celtic element had completely triumphed over the Teutonic, had absorbed and assimilated it or thrown it off, — had averted what seemed inevitable in the days of the first Carolingians, namely, that the intruding German element would so impress itself upon the Latinized Gauls that their country would become simply an extension of Germany.

108. Renewal of the Empire by Otto the Great (962). — In the division of the dominions of Charles the Great, the imperial title, as we have just seen, went to Lothair. The title, however, meant scarcely anything, carrying with it little or no real authority. The king who bore the title enjoyed a sort of nominal preëminence among the different rulers of the several fragments of the shattered empire, but that was all. Thus matters ran on for more than a century, the empty honor of the title sometimes being enjoyed by the kings of Italy, and again by those of the Eastern Franks.

But with the accession of Otto I to the throne of Germany in the year 936, there appeared among the princes of Europe a second Charles the Great. Besides being king of Germany, he became, through interference on request in the affairs of Italy, king of that country also. Furthermore, he wrested large tracts of land from the Slavs, and forced the Danes, Poles, and Hungarians to acknowledge his suzerainty. Thus favored by fortune, he naturally conceived the idea of reviving once more the imperial authority, just as it had been revived in the time of the great Charles.

So in 962, just a little more than a century and a half after the coronation at Rome of Charles the Great, Otto, at the same place and by the same papal authority, was crowned Emperor of the Romans. For a generation no one had borne the title. From this time on it was the rule that the prince whom the German electors chose as their king had a right to the crown of Italy and also to the imperial crown.

After this the empire came to be called the Holy Roman Empire, although, as Voltaire very truthfully remarked; it was "neither holy, nor Roman, nor an empire." Respecting the great part that the idea of the empire played in subsequent history we shall speak in a later chapter (chap. xii).

Sources and Source Material. — EGINHARD (Einhard), *Life of the Emperor Karl the Great* (translation by William Glaister recommended). Einhard was Charles's confidential friend and secretary. "Almost all our real, vivifying knowledge of Charles the Great," says Hodgkin, "is derived from Einhard, and . . . the *Vita Caroli* is one of the most precious bequests of the early Middle Ages." Henderson's *Select Historical Documents*, pp. 189–201, "Capitulary of Charlemagne, issued in the year 802." *Translations and Reprints* (Univ. of Penn.), vol. vi, No. 5, "Selections from the Laws of Charles the Great."

Secondary or Modern Works. — HODGKIN (T.), ***Charles the Great* (Foreign Statesmen), and MOMBERT (J. I.), *A History of Charles the Great.* The first is the best short biography in English. BRYCE (J.), *The Holy Roman Empire*, chaps. iv, v, and xxi, gives a clear view of the import of the restoration of the empire. EMERTON (E.), *Introduction to the Middle Ages*, chaps. xii–xiv. OMAN (C.), *The Dark Ages*, chaps. xx–xxii. GUIZOT (F. P. G.), *History of Civilization in France*, vol. i, lect. xx (see remarks, page 72). SERGEANT (L.), *The Franks* (Story of the Nations), chaps. xvi–xxii. An admirable sketch, with a calm and moderate appraisement of Charles's work. WEST (A. F.), *Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools* (Great Educators), and MULLINGER (J. B.), **The Schools of Charles the Great;* for the influence of the schools founded by Charles the Great upon the intellectual life of the Middle Ages. FREEMAN (E. A.), *The Chief Periods of European History*, lects. iii and iv. ADAMS (G. B.), *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. vii. DAVIS (H. W. C.), *Charlemagne* (Heroes of the Nations).

CHAPTER VIII

THE NORTHMEN: THE COMING OF THE VIKINGS

I. Introductory

109. The People and the Northern Lands. — Northmen, Norsemen, Scandinavians, are different names applied in a general way to the early inhabitants of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. For the reason that those making settlements in England came for the most part from Denmark, the term "Danes" is often used with the same wide application by the English writers.

These people were very near kin to those tribes, Goths, Vandals, Franks, Anglo-Saxons, and the rest, that seized upon the western provinces of the Roman empire. They were Teutons in language, religion, habits, and spirit. We cannot be certain when they took possession of the northern peninsulas, but it is probable that they had entered those countries long before Cæsar invaded Gaul.

If we think it strange that any of the Teutonic tribes should have chosen homes in those dreary regions, where the mid-winter sun scarcely appears above the southern horizon and the land and water are locked in frost and ice for a large portion of the year, we must call to mind that these peoples when they entered those lands had not yet advanced beyond the hunting and fishing stage of culture; and that the Scandinavian peninsula, rough with mountains and indented with numerous fiords, affords one of the best hunting and fishing districts of Europe, — a region which even now invites each summer the sportsman from England and other lands.

Besides, the country abounds in iron and copper, which metals these German warriors had learned to employ in the manufacture of their arms; and this perhaps was an additional attraction to the barbarians.

110. The Northmen as Pirates and as Colonizers. — For the first eight centuries of our era the Norsemen are practically hidden from our view in their remote northern home; but towards the end of the eighth century their black piratical crafts are to be seen creeping along the coasts of Britain, Ireland, and the Frankish empire, and even venturing far up the inlets and creeks.

Every summer these dreaded sea-rovers made swift descents upon the exposed shores of these countries, plundered, burned, murdered; and then upon the approach of the stormy season they returned to winter in the sheltered fiords of the northern peninsula. After a time the bold corsairs began to winter in the lands they had harried during the summer; and soon all the shores of the countries visited were dotted with their stations or settlements. With a foothold once secured, fresh bands came from the crowded lands of the North; the winter stations grew into permanent colonies; the surrounding country was gradually wrested from the natives; and in course of time the settlements coalesced into a real kingdom.

Thus Northern Gaul fell at last so completely into the hands of the Northmen as to take from them the name of *Normandy;* while Northeastern England, crowded with settlers from Denmark and surrendered to Danish rule, became known as the *Danelagh* (Dane-law). From Normandy, as a new base of operations, fresh colonies went out, and made conquests and settlements in South Italy and Sicily, and in England. While these things were going on in Europe, other bands of Northmen were pushing out into the western seas and colonizing Iceland and Greenland, and visiting the shores of the American *continent.*

Commencing in the latter part of the eighth century, these marauding expeditions and colonizing enterprises did not cease until the eleventh century was far advanced. The consequences of this wonderful outpouring of the Scandinavian peoples were so important and lasting that the movement may well be compared, as it has been, to the great migration of their German kinsmen in the fifth and sixth centuries. Europe is a second time inundated by the Teutonic barbarians.

The most noteworthy characteristic of these Northmen is the readiness with which they laid aside their own manners, habits, ideas, and institutions, and adopted those of the country in which they established themselves. "In Russia they became Russians; in France, Frenchmen; in Italy, Italians; in England, twice over Englishmen: first in the case of the Danes, and secondly in that of the later Normans." [1]

111. Causes of the Migration. — The main causes which have been assigned to what we may call the Scandinavian Migration are: (1) the Norseman's love of adventure and hope of plunder; (2) overpopulation; (3) the establishment in Denmark and Norway of great kingdoms, the tyranny of whose rulers led many to seek in other lands that freedom which was denied them at home; and (4) the existence of a rule of succession which gave everything to the eldest member of the family, leaving only the kingdom of the seas to the younger members.

The last-mentioned cause gave leaders to the bands that went out, their chiefs usually being portionless sons of the ruling or royal families. Because of their noble birth these chieftains, just as soon as they headed an expedition, were given the title of king, and so very naturally came to be called Sea-kings. The term "Viking," from *vic*, meaning a fiord or arm of the sea, is more properly used to designate those of humbler origin who could lay no claim to royal distinction.

[1] Johnson, *The Normans in Europe*, p. 19.

112. Settlements in Scotland, Ireland, and the Western Isles. — As early as the beginning of the ninth century the Northmen took possession of the Orkney and Shetland Islands and of the Hebrides. Before a century had elapsed the latter isles, in connection with the western coast of Scotland and a large part of Ireland, formed a sort of Scandinavian maritime kingdom, the rulers of which often disputed with the Celtic chiefs of Scotland and Ireland the possession of their lands, just as the Danes disputed with the English the possession of England. These Northmen played a most important part in the affairs of both Scotland and Ireland down to the thirteenth century.

113. Colonization of Iceland and Greenland. — The first Scandinavian colonists to Iceland were men fleeing from the tyranny of Harold Fairhair, king of Norway. They settled in the island about 874. In 1874 the Icelanders celebrated the millennial anniversary of the settlement of their island, an event very like our "Centennial" of 1876. The exiles established in the dreary island a sort of republic, and made that northern land, centuries before Columbus pushed out into the western seas and discovered the New World, the home of freedom.

Greenland was discovered by the Northmen in the year 981, and was colonized by them soon afterwards. Their settlements appear to have flourished for several centuries, and a number of churches and monasteries were built; but in the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the colonists were swept away by some obscure agency.

America was reached by the Northmen as early as the opening of the eleventh century; the "Vinland" of their traditions was probably some part of the New England coast. Whether these first visitors to the continent ever made any settlements in the new land is a disputed question. If they did, all *certain traces of* these had disappeared before the redis-

covery of the continent by the navigators of the sixteenth century.[2]

114. The Saga Literature of Iceland. — We have intimated that the early colonists of Iceland were men of quality and convictions, — choice spirits from among the Norwegians; men who exiled themselves from their native land because, like the Pilgrim Fathers, they preferred a life of hardship and exile with freedom, to one of ease and plenty at home with unworthy submission. The character of the settlers had its influence upon the history of the colony. Iceland became not only the hearth-place of liberty, but also the literary center of the Scandinavian world. It was to the Norse race what the isle of Chios was to the early Greeks. There grew up here a class of scalds, or bards, who, before the introduction of writing, preserved and transmitted orally the sagas or legends of the northern races. Ballads of wild exploits many of them are, thrilling with the fierce energy of the bold Vikings.

Towards the middle of the thirteenth century, according to the most trustworthy opinion, some person or persons collected many of these ancient mythological poems and legends then floating among the people, catching some or most of them evidently from the lips of the scalds. This collection, which was discovered in 1643, is known as the *Elder* or *Poetic Edda*. About the same time that this collection was made, another, known as the *Younger* or *Prose Edda*, was gathered by Snorro Sturleson (1178–1241), an Icelandic writer of renown, sometimes called the "Northern Herodotus."

These poems and legends of the northern nations, thus preserved to us amidst the snow and ice of the dreary island of the

[2] The story of the discovery of America by the Northmen was committed to writing in Iceland between the years 1387 and 1395; and as Columbus is known to have visited that island in 1477, it is conjectured by some that he may have there learned of the existence of a continent to the westward, and by these reports have been encouraged to persevere in the great undertaking of his life. In none of his writings, however, is there any hint that he was ever influenced in the least by such reports.

North Atlantic, are among the most interesting and important of the literary memorials that we possess of the early Teutonic peoples. They reflect faithfully the beliefs, manners, and customs of the Norsemen and the wild adventurous spirit of their Sea-kings.

115. The Norsemen in Russia. — While the Norwegians were sailing boldly out into the Atlantic and taking possession of the isles and coasts of the western seas, the Swedes were pushing their crafts across the Baltic and vexing all its shores. These sea-rovers at first directed their expeditions mainly against the Finnic and Slavonian tribes that dwelt upon the eastern shore of that sea, and exacted from them a tribute of furs and skins.

Gradually they extended their authority inland. About the middle of the ninth century we find the famous Scandinavian chief Rurik and his followers in possession of Kiev and Novgorod. Either by right of conquest or through the invitation of the contentious Slavonian clans, Rurik acquired, in the year 862, kingly dignity, and became the founder of the first royal line of Russia. The state established by him and his descendants was the beginning, or rather the prototype, of the great empire of the modern Tzars.

116. The Varangians at Constantinople. — Soon after the Northmen had established themselves in Russia, they launched their long boats on the rivers that flow into the Black Sea, and floated down these streams in search of fortune and adventure in the South. As formidable fighters they were welcomed by the emperors of the Eastern empire, and under the name of Varangians were enlisted into the imperial service and assigned the honorable duty of guarding the person of the emperor.

Their position at the Byzantine court was the same as that of the Pretorians at Rome, or of the Janizaries in the modern state of the Turkish sultans (par. 245). They rendered good service to the Eastern emperors in their struggles with their various enemies, being headed sometimes by distinguished

Scandinavian chiefs whom circumstances had driven into exile, or prospect of adventure had allured to the Mediterranean lands.

II. The Danes in England

117. Their Ravages in the Island. — The Northmen — Danes, as called by the English writers — began to make descents upon the English coast toward the close of the eighth century. These sea-rovers spread the greatest terror throughout the island; for they were not content with plunder, but, being pagans, they took special delight in burning the churches and monasteries of the now Christian Anglo-Saxons, or English as we shall hereafter call them. In a short time fully one-half of England was in their hands. The wretched English were subjected to exactly the same treatment that they had inflicted upon the Celts. Just when it began to look as though they would be wholly enslaved or driven from the island by the heathen intruders, Alfred came to the throne of Wessex (871).

118. King Alfred (871–901) **and the Danes.** — Alfred was the fourth and youngest son of Ethelwulf, being born in the year 849. While yet a mere child he accompanied his father to Rome and was adopted by the pope as his godson. Possibly this act was not without its influence upon the boy, for throughout his life Alfred was the staunch friend and zealous patron of the Church. However this may be, we may perhaps speak more positively of a mother's influence in forming the character and shaping the life of England's greatest king. King Ethelwulf's queen is said to have excited emulation among her children by offering a volume of Saxon poetry as a gift to the one who should be the first to commit the poems to memory. Alfred, who had a bright and active mind, won the prize. The love for the heroic tales and ballads of his race thus early awakened in the boy, we may well believe, had at least something to do in forming those literary tastes which gave aim and effort to so much of the activity of his maturer years.

Alfred had just reached manhood — he was in his twenty-second year — when, by the event of his brother Ethelred's death in battle with the Danes, he was called to the throne. The Danes already, as we have seen, held a large portion of England. For six years the youthful king fought heroically at the head of his brave thanes; but each year the possessions of the English grew smaller, and finally Alfred and his few remaining followers were forced to take refuge in the woods and morasses.

After a time, however, the affairs of Alfred began to mend. He gained some advantage over the Danes, but he could not expel them from the island, and by the treaty of Wedmore (878) gave up to them all the northeastern part of England. Guthrum, the Danish leader, received Christian baptism, but the accounts that we have of his subsequent conduct represent him as anything but an exemplary Christian.

After the subjection and settlement of Guthrum and his followers, Alfred's little kingdom was comparatively free from the ravages of the Danes for a period of ten or fifteen years; these years of quiet Alfred employed in building a fleet and in instituting measures of reform in his government.

But again the dreaded enemy renewed their forays, led now by the terrible Hasting. They were finally forced, however, to withdraw from the island and seek elsewhere spoils and settlements; and Alfred was permitted to pass his last years in something like quiet. The great king died in the year 901, in the fifty-third year of his age.[8]

119. Alfred as a Codifier of Laws and an Author. — Eminent as were Alfred's services to his people as a leader in war, still greater were those he rendered them as a lawgiver and an author. He collected and revised the ancient laws of the Anglo-Saxons, tempering and altering them in accordance with

[8] *England celebrated the millennial anniversary of his death in the year 1901.*


ENGLAND
AFTER
TREATY OF WEDMORE
878
Edwinsburgh (Edenburgh)
Bernicia
R. Tyne
Jarrow
Durham
I. OF MAN
Lincoln
Chester
NORTH
WALES
Shrewsbury
Lichfield
MERCIA
ALFRED'S
SOUTH
Gloucester
Burford
Oxford
Cirencester
Deorham
Chippenham
Ashdown
ESSEX
LONDON
I. OF THANET
Bristol Channel
Bristol
Stonehenge
KINGDOM
Canterbury
KENT
Glastonbury
Athelney
Salisbury
Winchester
SUSSEX
Senlac
Hastings
Mt. Badon
Corfe Castle
I. OF WIGHT
WEST WALES
ENGLISH CHANNEL

Christian morals and principles.[4] The code that he thus made formed the basis of early English jurisprudence.

But beyond all things else must be extolled those literary labors of King Alfred by which he fostered learning and gave the first impulse to English literature. By the ravages of the pagan Danes the libraries of the monasteries and churches had been destroyed, and this rendered still denser the ignorance of that ignorant age. Alfred tells us that there was not a single priest south of the Thames who could translate into English the Latin of his prayer-book. The king set himself zealously to work to improve this state of things. His ideal of education was that every youth in the land who had the time and means should be instructed to that extent which should enable him to read easily the English Bible.

But Alfred realized that little could be effected in the matter of instructing the people so long as all the books were written in an unknown language. So he himself became a translator, and turned many Latin works into English, writing prefaces, paraphrasing or abridging the text, and adding so many reflections of his own that he fairly earned the title of author. In this way he translated Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy* (par. 16), Orosius's *History of the World*, selections from Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*, and Pope Gregory the Great's *Pastoral Care*, a book of pious advice and admonition addressed to the clergy.

With the exception of the Bible, some short poems, and the well-known *Paraphrase of the Scriptures* by Cædmon (par. 35), these were the first books that the subjects of Alfred had placed in their hands written in their own tongue. Here we have the beginnings of the prose literature of England. "The mighty roll of the prose books that fill her libraries," says

[4] Alfred prefaced his code with the Decalogue and other selections from the Old Testament, and concluded it with these words among many others from the New: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." (Pauli's *Life of Alfred the Great*, p. 134.) This manifests in what spirit Alfred compiled his book of laws.

Green, "begins with the translations of Alfred, and above all with the chronicle[5] of his reign."

120. King Alfred's Character. — "This I can now truly say," wrote Alfred, "that so long as I have lived I have striven to live worthily, and after my death to leave my memory to my descendants in good works." It is not strange that the memory of a sovereign whose life was shaped by such a sentiment should be cherished with undying gratitude and affection by his people. He is the only sovereign of England on whom the title of Great has been conferred.

The historian Green declares that never before King Alfred had the world "seen a king who lived solely for the good of his people"; and his biographer, Pauli, closes his account of his life with these words: "Alfred's name will always be placed amongst those of the great spirits of this earth; and so long as men regard their past history with reverence, they will not venture to bring forward any other in comparison with him who saved the West Saxon race from complete destruction, and in whose heart the virtues dwelt in such harmonious concord."[6]

121. The Danish Conquest of England. — For a full century following the death of Alfred, his successors were engaged in a constant struggle to hold in restraint the Danes already settled in the land, or to protect their domains from the plundering inroads of fresh bands of pirates from the northern peninsulas.

The names of the earlier kings of this period we may leave unmentioned, although among these rulers were strong and worthy men; but we may not thus pass the name of Saint Dunstan (about 925–988), abbot of Glastonbury, archbishop of Canterbury, and for many years chief minister of the realm.

[5] The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle here alluded to was a minute and chronological record of events, probably begun in *systematic form* in Alfred's reign, and continued down to the year 1154. It was kept by the monks of different monasteries, and forms one of our most valuable sources for early English history.

[6] *Life of Alfred the Great* (Bohn), p. 235.

He was the first of a series of ecclesiastical statesmen of whom Wolsey was perhaps the greatest. During two reigns he was the power behind the throne. We can best indicate in a word his place in early English history by saying that as a teacher, as a moral reformer, and as a wise councilor he carried on the peaceful phases of the work which King Alfred had begun.

Dunstan's public activity ceased soon after the accession to the throne of the mean and weak Ethelred II (979–1016), surnamed the *Redeless*, that is, "lacking in counsel." Certainly the means which he employed against the sea-rovers could hardly have been more unadvised. He bought off the marauders, taxing his people heavily to raise the ransom money. It is easy to divine the outcome of such a policy. Just as soon as the Danes had spent the money received, they of course returned and demanded more, under threat of fire and sword.

Finally the expeditions became something more than a few shiploads of adventurers who could be satisfied with payments of gold. In the year 994 the kings of Denmark and Norway, Swegen and Olaf, joined their armies and fleets, determined upon the conquest of all England. Now for the first time the English had to face the organized forces of powerful kingdoms.

Any effectual resistance to the invaders was prevented, not only by the weak and cowardly character of the king, but by the lack of union among the different counties, for, as the Chronicle says, "no shire would so much as help other." At last Ethelred resolved upon a measure the most impolitic and cruel of his wretched reign. This was nothing less than the massacre of all the Danes settled in Wessex, because they were giving aid and comfort to their marauding kinsmen.

The Danes were set upon in all parts of the country on the same day (1002), and great numbers were slain. Among the killed was a sister of Swegen, who vowed to avenge her death and the murder of his countrymen by spreading desolation *throughout the length* and breadth of the accursed land. He

made good his threat. For ten years England was the scene of a most unrelenting warfare. There is no need to tell again the old story. The open country was harried, the towns were sacked, the churches and monasteries robbed and burned. Each year the crops were harvested by the sea-rovers.

Finally, in the year 1013, Swegen himself came with an immense fleet and army, drove Ethelred out of the island to Normandy, and caused himself to be declared by the Witan [7] King of England. The country yielded, and now for the first time a foreign king sat upon the throne of Egbert and Alfred.

Swegen lived to reign over the subjugated island only a few months. Upon his death the Danes in England chose his son Canute as his successor. As this prince was only nineteen years of age, his youth and inexperience encouraged the Witan to restore Ethelred to the throne, and to call upon the people to take up arms for the recovery of their freedom.

England was thus divided between two kings. Canute was supported by the Danish part of the population and Ethelred by the English. Again the flames of war were kindled throughout the land. Denmark sent out hundreds of shiploads of warriors. The old English spirit was stirred to its very depths. Even Ethelred displayed an alertness and energy which did much towards erasing the dishonor of previous years. He died in 1016, but his sturdy son, Edmund Ironsides, battled on with the hated Danes. Well did he deserve the surname he bears. With a worthy successor of the noble Alfred to lead them against their hated foes, the English rallied from one end of the land to the other for a renewal of the desperate struggle. Within seven months Edmund fought six great battles. In the last, in the words of the Chronicle, "all England fought against Canute, but Canute had the victory."

[7] The Witan, or Witenagamot, which means the "Meeting of the Wise Men," was the common council of the realm. The House of Lords of the present Parliament is a survival of this early national assembly.

Soon after this battle Edmund consented to a division of the kingdom between himself and the Danish king. This arrangement was very like that made between Alfred and Guthrum more than one hundred years before.

Scarcely had the affairs of the kingdom been thus composed, when Canute was made king of all England by the sudden death of Edmund (1016). With Edmund Ironsides passed away the bravest and most illustrious of the English kings since the days of Alfred.

122. The Reign of Canute (1016–1035). — The moment Canute exchanged the sword for the scepter his character seemed to undergo an entire transformation. He seemed to think with the Greek poet Euripides, as Freeman says, that "unrighteousness might be practiced in order to obtain a crown, but that righteousness should be practiced in all other times and places." He thought more of England than of his own Denmark, and all through his reign manifested in ways very pleasing to the English his preference for this portion of his empire, which at its greatest extent embraced — besides England — Norway and Denmark, with a sort of overlordship of Sweden.

The character of Canute is shown by his familiar letter to his English subjects during his absence on a pilgrimage to Rome.

The epistle reads like a message from a father to his children. Canute tells his people all about the things he had seen, what had befallen him, how royally he had been treated by the emperor and the pope and the other great persons he had met, and how he had secured from the head of the Church great and special privileges for the Christians of England. And then as his heart seems to overflow with a sense of his blessings and the kindness of Providence to himself, he confesses his errors of the past and promises that he will ever in the future rule justly and in the fear of God.

123. Restoration of the English Line (1042). — After a reign *of eighteen years*, a period of almost perfect peace and

prosperity for England, Canute died in the year 1035. Straightway his empire, embracing four kingdoms, the most extensive realms over which a single scepter had been stretched since the time of Charles the Great, fell to pieces.

England was divided between Harold and Harthacanute, both cruel and miserable kings, unworthy sons and successors of their pious father. Their short and confused reigns present no event of interest or instruction. Upon the death without heirs of Harthacanute in 1042 — he had, two years before, on the death of Harold, been elected sole king by the Witan — the old English line was restored in the person of Edward, son of Ethelred and the Norman Emma, better known as the Confessor. The wretched reigns of the sons of Canute had caused the hearts of the English to turn with fresh loyalty to their own exiled prince. "Before Harthacanute was buried, all people," writes the chronicler, "chose Edward for king at London."

Thus ended the Danish rule in England after an existence of almost exactly a quarter of a century (1016–1042).

124. Results of the Danish Conquest. — The great benefit which resulted to England from the Danish conquest was the infusion of fresh blood into the veins of the English people, who through contact with the half-Romanized Celts, and especially through the enervating influence of a monastic church, had lost much of that bold, masculine vigor which characterized their hardy ancestors. The number of Danes that settled in England was very large. The northeastern part of the country became thoroughly Danish. Being close kin to the English, the Danes added no new element to the population; but they invigorated and strengthened the old Teutonic stock, which was soon to stand in need of all its strength and vitality if it would preserve its distinctive character in spite of the disaster destined soon to befall the English nation. We allude to the conquest of England by William of Normandy, of which important event we shall come to speak in a later chapter (chap. xi).

III. Settlement of the Northmen in Gaul

125. Rollo and Charles the Simple. — It was just at the end of the eighth century (in 799) that the Northmen made their first piratical descent upon the shores of Gaul. Though Charles the Great with his strong arm was able to protect his dominion from their forays during his own lifetime, his mind was filled with anxious forebodings for his successors. Tradition tells how the great king, catching sight one day from one of the southern ports of Gaul of some ships of the Northmen cruising in the Mediterranean, wept as he reflected on the suffering that he foresaw the new foe would entail upon his country. Charles had been dead only thirty years when these sea-rovers ascended the Seine and sacked Paris (845).

We need not stop to give in detail the story of their subsequent plundering expeditions in Gaul and of their final settlement in the northwest of the country, for all this is simply a repetition of the tale of the Danish forays and settlement in England. Indeed, the story seems to repeat itself in the minutest details. At first the bands that came were mere pirates. Again and again did the Carolingian kings have resort to the device of the English rulers, and buy off the invaders, of course with similar final results. At last, in the year 912, Charles the Simple did something very like what Alfred the Great had done across the Channel only a short time before. He granted to Rollo, the leader of the Northmen who had settled at Rouen, a considerable section of country in the north of Gaul, upon condition of homage and conversion. The treaty was cemented by the marriage of the daughter of Charles to Rollo.

126. Transformation of the Northmen in Gaul. — "As the Danes that settled in England became Englishmen, so did the Danes or Northmen that settled in France become Frenchmen." This transformation took place sooner in the latter country than *in the former*, for the reason that the Norse

settlements in Gaul were more scattered than those in England, and consequently the strangers were brought into more intimate relation with the native inhabitants. Hence in a short time they had adopted the language, the manners, and the religion of the French, and had caught much of their vivacity and impulsiveness of spirit, without, however, any loss of their own native virtues. This transformation in manners and life we may conceive as being recorded in their transformed name — Northmen becoming softened into Norman.

127. Normandy in French History. — The establishment of a Scandinavian settlement in Gaul proved a most momentous matter, not only for the history of the French people, but for the history of European civilization as well. This Norse factor was destined to be one of the most important of all those various racial elements which on the soil of the old Gaul blended to create the richly dowered French nation. For many of the most romantic passages of her history France is indebted to the adventurous spirit of the descendants of these wild rovers of the sea. The knights of Normandy lent an added splendor to French knighthood, and helped greatly to make France the hearth of chivalry and the center of the crusading movement of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Nor was the influence of the incoming of this Scandinavian race felt alone upon French history. Normandy became the point of departure of enterprises that had deep and lasting consequences for Europe at large. These undertakings had for their arena England and the Mediterranean lands. Their results were so important and far-reaching that we shall devote to the narration of them a subsequent chapter (chap. xi).

Sources and Source Material. — *The Heimskringla*, or *Chronicle of the Kings of Norway* (trans. from the Icelandic of Snorro Sturleson by Samuel Laing), 3 vols.; London, 1844. In his introduction Sturleson (par. 114) says: "In this book I have had old stories written down, as *I heard them* told by intelligent people, concerning chiefs who held *dominion in the Northern* countries. . . . Although we cannot just say

what truth there may be in them, yet we have the certainty that old and wise men held them to be true." These sagas are of surpassing value to us for the reason that, in the words of Keary, they are "the last articulate voice of Teutonic heathenism." *The Story of Burnt Njal* (trans. by George W. Dasent). An Icelandic saga; a picture of times and manners. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Bohn). Examine entries for the years 787–1042. Colby's *Selections from the Sources of English History*, Nos. 8, 9, and 10. Kendall's *Source-Book of English History*, chap. ii, "England and the Danes." ASSER, *Annals of the Reign of Alfred the Great;* in "Six Old English Chronicles" (Bohn). *Old South Leaflets*, No. 112, "King Alfred's Description of Europe." GREGORY THE GREAT, *The Book of Pastoral Rule* (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. xii).

Secondary or Modern Works. — KEARY (C. F.), ***The Vikings in Western Christendom* (A.D. 789–888). A scholarly work and one of absorbing interest. The author depicts the various Viking undertakings as "one phase . . . of the long struggle between Christianity and the heathenism of the North." PAULI (R.), ***The Life of Alfred the Great* (Bohn). A masterly sketch. The best life of the great king. GREEN (J. R.), *The Conquest of England;* all excepting chaps. x and xi. WHEATON (H.), *History of the Northmen* (Philadelphia, 1831). A little book of sound scholarship. DU CHAILLU (P. B.), *The Viking Age*, 2 vols. Reflects the life and ideals, customs and manners of the Norsemen, chiefly as depicted in the sagas. HUGHES (T.), *Alfred the Great.* Very interesting. OMAN (C.), *The Dark Ages*, chap. xxiv. BOYESEN (H. H.), *The Story of Norway* (Story of the Nations). The opening chapters. LINGARD (J.), *History of England*, vol. i. The millenary celebration of Alfred's death has called into existence an "Alfred Library." Among these recent books the following should be noticed: MACFADYEN (D.), *Alfred, the West Saxon* (Saintly Lives). BOWKER (A.), *Alfred the Great.* The several essays comprising this admirable little volume are contributed by different writers. DRAPER (W. H.), *Alfred the Great: A Sketch and Seven Studies.*

CHAPTER IX

RISE OF THE PAPAL POWER

128. The Constitution of the Early Church. — In an early chapter of our book we told how Christianity as a system of beliefs and precepts took possession of the different nations and tribes of Europe. We propose in the present chapter to tell how the Church, moulded by great men and favored by circumstances, grew into what was practically a universal monarchy, with the bishop of Rome as its head.

There are two views respecting the nature of the organization of the early Christian Church. One view is that there existed from the very first a hierarchical system of government, such as marks the Catholic Church of to-day. Another view is that at the outset the Church consisted of isolated and practically independent societies, and that while some persons enjoyed precedence in honor, none had precedence in authority. This means, in a word, that in the beginning the local churches formed an association or fraternity without any real government. All historical scholars are agreed, however, that at the end of the fourth century there existed in the Church a regular hierarchy, consisting of various ranks of officers, of which deacons, priests or presbyters, and bishops, were the most important. The bishops collectively formed what is known as the episcopate. There were already four grades of bishops, namely, country bishops, city bishops, metropolitans or archbishops, and patriarchs. The metropolitan bishop was the bishop of the capital or the chief city of a province, and stood above the other bishops of his district. *The patriarch* had authority over the metropolitans. There

were at the end of the fourth century five patriarchates, that is, regions ruled by patriarchs. These centered in the great cities of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.

129. Claims of Primacy by the Roman Bishops. — It is respecting the question as to what were the relations of the early patriarch of Rome to the other patriarchs and bishops that the opposing views of the two schools of interpreters of history, to which we have referred, become of greatest interest to the historical student. The view of Catholic scholars is that the bishop of Rome was from the very first, by divine appointment, superior to all other bishops and patriarchs, not only in dignity but also in authority. The view of Protestant scholars is that the patriarchs at the outset possessed equal and coördinate powers; that is, that no one of the patriarchs had authority or jurisdiction over the others, although to the patriarch of Rome was accorded an honorary precedence.

However this may be, it is a fact that very early the patriarchs of Rome laid claim to possessing supremacy over all other bishops and patriarchs, and to being the divinely appointed head of the Church Universal. This claim was based on several grounds, the chief of which was that the church at Rome — so it was urged — had been founded by Saint Peter himself, the first bishop of that capital, whom Christ had intrusted with the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and had invested with superlative authority as a teacher and interpreter of the Word by the commission "Feed my sheep; . . . feed my lambs," thus giving into his charge the entire flock of the Church. This authority and preëminence conferred by the great Head of the Church upon Peter was held to be transmitted to his successors in the holy office.

By about the close of the sixth century the claims of the Roman bishops were very generally recognized, and from this time on the title of pope in the later significance universally

given it may properly be applied to them.[1] Besides the influence of great men, such as Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, and Nicholas I, who held the seat of Saint Peter, there were various historical circumstances that contributed to the realization by the Roman bishops of their claim to supremacy and aided them vastly in establishing the almost universal authority of the mediæval papacy. In the following paragraphs we shall enumerate eleven of these concurrent circumstances. These several matters constitute the great landmarks in the rise and growth of the papacy. Under one or another of the heads which we shall give may be gathered most of the really important facts in the history of the papacy during the first seven or eight centuries of the life of the Christian Church.

130. The Belief in the Primacy of Saint Peter and in the Founding by him of the Church at Rome. — It came to be believed that the apostle Peter had been given by the Master a sort of primacy among his fellow apostles. The grounds for this claim were found in certain scriptural passages, some of which we have already cited. It also came to be believed that Peter himself had founded the church at Rome. It is probable that he did so, and that he suffered martyrdom there under the emperor Nero.

These beliefs and interpretations of history, which make the Roman bishops the successors of the first of the apostles and the holders of his seat, contributed greatly, of course, to enhance their reputation and to justify their claim to a primacy of authority over all the dignitaries of the Church.

131. Repute of the Roman Bishops for Orthodoxy. — According to most Roman Catholic authorities, all the bishops of Rome, except two, during the first, second, and third centuries, were martyrs of the faith that had been delivered unto

[1] At first the title *papa*, or "pope," was given to every bishop in the West; after the fifth century its use was restricted to the patriarchs, and finally it became the special and exclusive designation of the Roman bishop. See Schaff's *History of the Christian Church*, vol. iii, p. 300, note.

the holy apostles. This steadfastness was believed to be a gracious answer to the prayer of Christ for Peter. "I have prayed for thee," said the Master to that disciple, "that thy faith fail not."

When the age of controversy came between the Eastern patriarchs and the bishops of Rome, then this reputed conservatism of the Latin bishops, in contrast with the speculative tendencies of the Greek prelates, contributed vastly to increase throughout the orthodox West their influence and authority.

132. Advantages of their Position at the Political Center of the World. — The claims of the Roman bishops were in the early centuries greatly favored by the spell in which the world was held by the name and prestige of imperial Rome. Thence it had been accustomed to receive commands in all temporal matters; how very natural, then, that thither it should turn for command and guidance in spiritual affairs. The Roman bishops in thus occupying the geographical and political center of the world enjoyed a great advantage over all other bishops and patriarchs. The halo that during many centuries of wonderful history had gathered about the Eternal City came naturally to invest with a kind of aureole the head of the Christian bishop.

133. Effect of the Removal of the Imperial Government to Constantinople. — Nor was this advantage which was given the Roman bishops by their position at Rome lost when the old capital ceased to be an imperial city. The removal by the acts of Diocletian and Constantine of the chief seat of the government to the East, instead of diminishing the power and dignity of the Roman bishops, tended greatly to promote their claims and authority. In the phrase of Dante, it "gave the Shepherd room." It left the pontiff the foremost personage in Rome.

134. The Pastor as Protector of Rome. — Again, when the barbarians came, there came another occasion for the Roman bishops to widen their influence and enhance their authority. Rome's *extremity* was their opportunity. Thus it will be

recalled how Pope Innocent I, through his intercession, saved the churches of Rome from the fate that befell the heathen temples when Rome was sacked by Alaric; how mainly through the intercession of the pious Pope Leo the Great the fierce Attila was persuaded to turn back and spare the imperial city; and how the same bishop, in the year 455, also appeased in a measure the wrath of the Vandal Geiseric and shielded the inhabitants from the worst passions of a barbarian soldiery (par. 25).[2]

Thus when the emperors, the natural defenders of the capital, were unable to protect it, the unarmed Pastor was able, through the awe and reverence inspired by his holy office, to render services that could not but result in bringing increased honor and dignity to the Roman see.

135. Effects upon the Papacy of the Fall of Rome. — But if the misfortunes of the empire tended to the enhancement of the reputation and influence of the Roman bishops, much more did its final downfall in the West tend to the same end. Upon the surrender of the sovereignty of the West into the hands of the emperor of the East, the bishops of Rome became the most important personages in Western Europe, and being so far removed from the court at Constantinople gradually assumed almost imperial powers. They became the arbiters between the barbarian chiefs and the Italians, and to them were referred for decision the disputes arising between cities, states, and kings. Especially did the bishops and archbishops throughout the West in their contest with the Arian barbarian rulers look to Rome for advice and help.

It is easy to see how directly and powerfully these things tended to strengthen the authority and increase the influence of the Roman bishops. During this time Gregory the Great (590–604), who was the most eminent of the early popes, ruled as though he were a temporal prince, and administered affairs *almost* like an independent sovereign.

[2] See *Rome: its Rise and Fall*, pars. 273, 278, and 279.

130. The Missions of Rome. — Again, the early missionary zeal of the church of Rome made her the mother of many churches, all of whom looked up to her with affectionate and grateful loyalty. Thus the Angles and Saxons, won to the faith by the missionaries of Rome, conceived a deep veneration for the holy see and became its most devoted children. To Rome it was that the English Christians made their most frequent pilgrimages, and thither they sent their offering of Saint Peter's pence. And when the Saxons became missionaries to their pagan kinsmen of the Continent, they transplanted into the heart of Germany these same feelings of filial attachment and love. The Saxon monk, Saint Boniface, "the Apostle of Germany," with whose labors we are already familiar (par. 37), while winning the heathen of the German forests to a love for the Cross, inspired them also with a profound reverence for the Roman see. Boniface himself took a solemn oath of fealty to the Roman pontiff, and the bishops of the German churches that arose through the efforts of this zealous apostle were required to promise a like obedience to Rome. And it was through the influence of the same devoted missionary that in the Council of Frankfort, held in 742, the bishops of Gaul and Germany resolved that the metropolitans, or archbishops, of the Gallic and German churches should receive the pallium from the hands of the pope, in token of their subjection and allegiance to the Roman see.

Thus was Rome exalted in the eyes of the children of the churches of the West, until Gregory II (715–731), writing the Eastern emperor, could say, "All the lands of the West have their eyes directed towards our humility; by them we are considered as a god upon earth."[8]

137. Result of the Fall of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria before the Saracens. — In the seventh century all the great cities of the East fell into the hands of the Moslems. This was a matter of tremendous consequence for the church of

[8] *Quoted by* Ranke, *History of the Popes*, vol. i, p. 13.

Rome, since in every one of these great capitals there was, or might have been, a rival of the Roman bishop. The virtual erasure of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria from the map of Christendom left only one city, Constantinople, that could possibly nourish a rival of the Roman church. Thus did the very misfortunes of Christendom give an added security to the growing power of the Roman prelate.

138. The Iconoclastic Controversy (726–842); **the Popes become Temporal Sovereigns.** —The dispute about the worship of images, known in church history as the "War of the Iconoclasts," which broke out in the eighth century between the Greek churches of the East and the Latin churches of the West, drew after it far-reaching consequences as respects the growing power of the Roman pontiffs.

Even long before the seventh century, at which time the power of Mohammedanism arose, Christianity in the Eastern lands had lost very much of its early simplicity and purity. It had undergone a process of paganization. The churches were crowded with images or pictures of the apostles, saints, and martyrs, which to many were objects of superstitious veneration. They were believed to possess miraculous virtues and powers. Every city and almost every church possessed its wonder-working image, the patron and protector of the place.

It is easy to understand, then, the effect produced upon the minds of men when, in the seventh century, the Cross everywhere throughout the East went down before the Crescent, and the images of apostles and saints were found powerless to protect even their own shrines. The feeling awakened among the Eastern Christians by these disasters was precisely the same as that aroused among the pagan inhabitants of the Roman empire when, amidst the calamities of the barbarian invasion, the ancient deities were found powerless to give protection to the cities and temples of which they had been *thought the special* guardians.

The Moslem conquerors, reproaching the Christians as idolaters, broke to pieces the images about the very altars, and yet no fire fell from heaven to punish the sacrilege. The Christians were filled with shame and confusion. A strong party arose, who, like the party of reform among the ancient Hebrews, declared that God had given the Church over into the hands of the infidels because the Christians had departed from his true worship and fallen into gross idolatry. These opposers of the use of images in worship took the name of Iconoclasts (image-breakers). They were the reformers of the East. At a great ecclesiastical council held at Constantinople in 754, it was decreed that "all visible symbols of Christ, except in the Eucharist, were either blasphemous or heretical; that image-worship was a corruption of Christianity, and a revival of paganism; and that all such monuments of idolatry should be broken or erased."

Leo the Isaurian, who came to the throne of Constantinople in 716, was a most zealous Iconoclast. The Greek churches of the East having been cleared of images, the emperor resolved to clear also the Latin churches of the West of these "symbols of idolatry." To this end he issued a decree that they should not be used.

The bishop of Rome, Pope Gregory II, not only opposed the execution of the edict, but by the ban of excommunication cut off the emperor and all the iconoclastic churches of the East from communion with the true Catholic Church.[4]

In this quarrel with the Eastern emperors the Roman bishops cast about for an alliance with some powerful Western prince. First they made friends with the Lombards, whom they soon

[4] By the decree of a synod held at Constantinople in 842, images — paintings and mosaics only — were restored in the Eastern churches. But by this time such an accumulation of causes of alienation had arisen, that the breach between the two sections of Christendom could not be closed. In the latter half of the eleventh century came the permanent separation of the Church of the East from that of the West. The former became known as the Greek, Byzantine, or *Eastern Church; the* latter as the Latin, Roman, or Catholic Church.

found to be dangerous protectors. Then they turned to the Franks. We have already told the story of the friendship of the Carolingian kings and the Roman pontiffs, and of the favors they exchanged. Never did friends render themselves more serviceable to each other. The popes made the descendants of the house of Pippin kings and emperors; the grateful Frankish princes defended the popes against all their enemies, imperial and barbarian, and dowering them with cities and provinces, laid the basis of their temporal sovereignty (par. 100).

Thus to the spiritual authority which the Roman bishops had been gradually acquiring was added temporal power, which, though later a source of weakness to them, was undoubtedly at first an element of strength, and one of the stepping-stones by which they mounted to the throne of the sovereignty of the West.

139. The Donation of Constantine and the False Decretals. — The cause of the Roman pontiffs, from about the eighth or ninth century forward, was greatly furthered by two of the most surprising and successful forgeries in all history. These famous documents are known as the Donation of Constantine and the False Decretals.

The probable object of the former was to support and justify the donation of Pippin by providing evidence of a similar and earlier donation by the first imperial patron of the Church. It "tells how Constantine the Great, cured of his leprosy by the prayers of Sylvester, resolved, on the fourth day from his baptism, to forsake the ancient seat for a new capital on the Bosphorus, lest the continuance of the secular government should cramp the freedom of the spiritual, and how he bestowed therewith upon the pope and his successors the sovereignty over Italy and the countries of the West." [5]

[5] Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, p. 100. What Constantine really did grant the Church was the right to acquire legal title to landed property and to *receive bequests*, — a right which she did not enjoy under the pagan emperors. *Diocletian confiscated* what wealth the churches had gathered in his time.

The so-called Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, which appeared about the middle of the ninth century, tended to a similar end as did the Donation of Constantine, although they were originally put out in the interest of the bishops and not of the pope. They formed part of a collection of church documents, and included many alleged letters and edicts of the early popes. Granting their genuineness, they went to prove that the bishops of Rome in the second and third centuries exercised all that authority and extensive jurisdiction which were now being claimed by the popes of the ninth century.

In that uncritical age the documents were received by everybody as authentic.[6] The popes triumphantly appealed to them in support of their largest claims. They are now acknowledged by all scholars, Catholic as well as Protestant, to have been forged; nevertheless they worked as effectively as though they had been genuine for the confirming of the papal power.

140. Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction; Appeals to Rome. — Charles the Great had recognized the principle, held from early times by the Church, that ecclesiastics should be amenable only to the ecclesiastical tribunals, by freeing the whole body of the clergy from the jurisdiction of the temporal courts, in criminal as well as in civil cases. Gradually the bishops acquired the right to try all cases relating to marriage, trusts, perjury, simony, or concerning widows, orphans, or crusaders, on the ground that such cases had to do with religion. Even the right to try all criminal cases was claimed on the ground that all crime is sin, and hence can properly be dealt with only by the Church. Persons convicted by the ecclesiastical tribunals were subjected to penance, imprisoned in the monasteries, or handed over to the civil authorities.

Thus by the end of the twelfth century the Church had absorbed a great part of the criminal administration of both

[6] Laurentius Valla (1406–1457), one of the greatest of the humanists (par. 308), was the first to demonstrate the real character of the Donation of Constantine.

the laity and the clergy. The temporal princes, not perceiving whither this thing tended, at first favored this extension of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Thus, for a single illustration, in 857 Charles the Bald of France gave to the bishops a right to investigate all cases involving robbery, murder, and other crimes, and to hand offenders over to the counts for punishment.

Now the particular feature of this enormous extension of the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical tribunals which at present it especially concerns us to notice is the establishment of the principle that all cases might be appealed or cited from the courts of the bishops and archbishops of the different European countries to the papal see, which thus became the court of last resort in all cases affecting ecclesiastics or concerning religion. The pope thus came to be regarded as the fountain of justice, and, in theory at least, the supreme judge of Christendom, while emperors and kings and all civil magistrates bore the sword simply as his ministers to carry into effect his sentences and decrees.

This principle of the subordination of the local tribunals of the Church to the court of Rome was not established, it should here be said, without a long and bitter contest between the popes and the bishops, — a struggle very like that carried on during nearly the same centuries between the kings of Europe and their feudatories. But, as the final issue of the contest in the temporal realm was the subjection of the feudal aristocracy to the royal authority, and the concentration of all power in the hands of the kings, so likewise the outcome of the struggle in the spiritual realm was the subjection of the ecclesiastical aristocracy to the papal authority, and the centering of supreme jurisdiction in the hands of the Roman pontiff.

In another chapter we shall say something of the way in which the popes used the great authority with which they had now become invested and of the memorable struggle for supremacy between them and the German emperors *(chap. xii)*.

Sources and Source Material. — Henderson's *Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, pp. 319–329, "The Donation of Constantine."

Secondary or Modern Works. — HATCH (E.), ** *The Organization of the Early Christian Church.* The best work on the subject from the Protestant side. FISHER (G. P.), *History of the Christian Church.* The earlier chapters. Concise, fair, and scholarly. HURST (J. F.), *History of the Christian Church*, vol. i. Consult Table of Contents. SCHAFF (P.), *History of the Christian Church* (5th ed., New York, 1899), vol. iii, chap. v, "The Hierarchy and Polity of the Church." ALZOG (J.), *Manual of Universal Church History* (from the German), vol. ii, pp. 481–510. The Catholic view of the subject by an eminent scholar. MILMAN (H. H.), *History of Latin Christianity.* Selected chapters in vols. i and ii. EMERTON (E.), *Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages*, chap. ix, "The Rise of the Christian Church." ADAMS (G. B.), *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. vi, "The Formation of the Papacy." CARDINAL GIBBONS, *The Faith of Our Fathers*, chap. ix, "The Primacy of Peter," and chap. x, "The Supremacy of the Popes." A plain, authoritative statement of the Catholic view of these matters. LEA (H. C.), *Studies in Church History.* A series of scholarly and interesting essays. The earlier portion of the work deals with "The Rise of the Temporal Power" and "Benefit of Clergy." BOWDEN (J. W.), *Life of Gregory the Seventh*, vol. i, chap. i. A rapid sketch of the transformation of the episcopal aristocracy into the papal monarchy. STILLÉ (C. J.), *Studies in Mediæval History*, chap. ix, "The Papacy to the Reign of Charlemagne." BURY (J. B.), *History of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. ii. Consult Table of Contents. VON DÖLLINGER (J. J. I.), *Fables respecting the Popes of the Middle Ages* (from the German). Contains the most important study available in English on the Donation of Constantine. In Epochs of Church History series: CARR (A.), *The Church and the Roman Empire*, chap. xxiv, "Leo I and the Church of Rome"; and TOZER (H. F.), *The Church and the Eastern Empire*, chap. vi, "The Iconoclastic Controversy."

SECOND PERIOD — THE AGE OF REVIVAL

(From the Opening of the Eleventh Century to the Discovery of America by Columbus in 1492)

CHAPTER X

FEUDALISM AND CHIVALRY

I. Feudalism

141. Feudalism defined.—"Feudalism" is the name given to a special form of society and government, based upon a peculiar tenure of land,[1] which prevailed in Europe during the latter part of the Middle Ages, attaining, however, its most perfect development in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries.

The three most essential features of the system were: (1) the beneficiary nature of property in land; (2) the existence of a close personal bond between the grantor of an estate and the receiver of it; (3) the full or partial rights of sovereignty which the holder of an estate had over those living upon it.

An estate of this nature — it might embrace a few acres or an entire kingdom — was called a *fief*, or *feud*, whence the

[1] There is nothing more fundamental in social or economic arrangements than the way in which land is held. Among most civilized peoples to-day private ownership of the soil is almost universal, while among races still in the stage of primitive culture the land is usually regarded as the common heritage and property of the clan or tribe. The feudal system was based on a species of land tenure which partook of the nature of each of these two great systems of land-holding. At the present time there is a strong party, composed of followers of the economist Henry George, who condemn private property in land and advocate municipal or national ownership of the soil. The adoption of their proposals would effect a great social and economic revolution.

term "Feudalism." The person granting a fief was called the *suzerain, liege*, or *lord;* the one receiving it, his *vassal, liegeman*, or *retainer*.

A person receiving a large fief might parcel it out in tracts to others on terms similar to those on which he himself had received it. This regranting of feudal lands was known as *subinfeudation;* in principle it was not unlike what we know as the subletting of lands. The process of subinfeudation might be carried on to almost any degree. Practically it was seldom carried beyond the fourth stage.

142. The Ideal System. — The few definitions given above will render intelligible the following explanation of the theory of the feudal system. We take the theory first for the reason that the theory of the system is infinitely simpler than the thing itself. In fact, feudalism, as we find it in actual practice, was one of the most complex institutions that the mediæval ages produced.

In theory all the kings of the earth were vassals of the Emperor, who according to good imperialists was God's vassal, and according to good churchmen, the pope's. The kings received their dominions as fiefs to be held on conditions of loyalty to their suzerain and of fealty to right and justice. Should a king become disloyal or rule unjustly and wickedly, through such misconduct he forfeited his fief, and it might be taken from him by his suzerain and given to another worthier liegeman.

In the same way as the king received his fief from the Emperor, so might he grant it out in parcels to his chief men, they, in return for it, promising, in general, to be faithful to him as their lord, and to serve and aid him. Should these men, now vassals, be in any way untrue to their engagement, they forfeited their fiefs, and these might be resumed by their suzerain and bestowed upon others.

In like manner these immediate vassals of the king, or suzerain, might parcel out their domains in smaller tracts to

others, on conditions similar to those upon which they had themselves received theirs; and so on down through any number of stages.

We have thus far dealt only with the soil of a country. We must next notice what disposition was made of the people under this system.

The king in receiving his fief was intrusted with sovereignty over all persons living upon it; he became their commander, their lawmaker, and their judge, — practically, their absolute and irresponsible ruler. Then, when he parceled out his fief among his great men, he invested them, within the limits of the fiefs granted, with all his own sovereign rights. Each vassal became a virtual sovereign in his own domain. And when these great vassals subdivided their fiefs and granted portions of them to others, they in turn invested their vassals with more or less of those powers of sovereignty with which they themselves had been clothed.[2]

To illustrate the workings of the system, we will suppose the king, or suzerain, to be in need of an army. He calls upon his own immediate vassals for aid; these in turn call upon their vassals; and so the order runs down through the various stages of the hierarchy. Each lord commands only his own vassals. The retainers in the lowest rank rally around their respective lords, who, with their bands, gather about their lords, and so on up through the rising tiers of the hierarchy, until the immediate vassals of the suzerain, or lord paramount, present themselves before him with their graduated trains of followers. The array constitutes a feudal army, — a splendidly organized body in theory, but in fact an extremely poor instrument for warfare.

Such was the ideal feudal state. It is needless to say that the ideal was never perfectly realized. The system simply

[2] The holders of small fiefs were not allowed to exercise the more important functions of sovereignty. Thus, of the estimated number of seventy thousand fief-holders in France in the tenth century, only between one and two hundred *possessed the right "to coin* money, levy taxes, make laws, and administer their own *justice." See Kitchin's History of France*, vol. i, p. 191 (4th ed., Oxford, 1899).

made more or less distant approaches to it in the several European countries. But this general idea which we have tried to give of the theory of the system will help to an understanding of it as we find it in actual existence.

143. Roman and Teutonic Elements in the System. — Like many another institution that grew up on the conquered soil of the empire, feudalism was of a composite character; that is, it contained both Roman and Teutonic elements. The very name itself is, according to some, a compound of the Latin *fides*, "trust," and the Teutonic *od*, "an estate in land." This is very doubtful; but whatever may have been the origin of the word, the thing it represents was certainly compounded of classical and barbarian elements. The warp was Teutonic, but the woof was Roman. The spirit of the institution was barbarian, but the form was classical. We might illustrate the idea we are trying to convey, by referring to the mediæval papal Church. It, while Hebrew in spirit, was Roman in form. It had shaped itself upon the model of the empire, and was thoroughly imperial in its organization. Thus was it with feudalism. Beneath the Roman garb it assumed, beat a German life.

Just what ideas and customs among the Teutons, and what principles and practices among the Romans, constituted the germs out of which feudalism was actually developed, it would be very difficult to say. In some countries, as in England and Scandinavia, there grew up a form of feudal society which was almost entirely uninfluenced by Roman institutions; while in France a very different and much more perfect feudal system was developed, whose forms were determined largely by Gallo-Roman influences.

We will now in three distinct paragraphs say a word about the probable origin of those three prominent features of the system which have already been mentioned, — namely, the *fief*, the *patronage*, and the *sovereignty*.

144. The Origin of Fiefs. — In the sixth century probably the greater part of the soil of the countries which had once

formed a part of the Roman empire in the West was held by what was called an *allodial* or *freehold* tenure. The landed proprietor owned his domain absolutely, held it just as a man among us holds his estate. He enjoyed it free from any rent or service due to a superior, save of course public taxes and duties. But by the end of the eleventh century probably the larger part of the land in these same countries, as well as in other regions into which the feudal system had been carried, was held by a beneficiary or feudal tenure. We must now see how this great change came about.

The fief grew out of the *beneficium*, a form of estate well known among the Romans.[8] When the barbarians overran the soil of the empire, they appropriated, as we have seen, a good part of it to their own use. The king or leader of the invading tribe naturally had allotted to him a large share. Following his custom of bestowing gifts of arms and other articles upon his companions, he granted to his followers and friends parcels of his domains, upon the simple condition of faithfulness. At first these estates were bestowed only for life, and were called by the Latin name of *benefices;* but in the course of time they became hereditary, and then they began to be called *fiefs*, or *feuds*. They took this latter name about the ninth century. As the royal lands were very extensive and were being constantly added to by inheritance and successful wars, these were a very important source of feudal estates.

Another and still more important source of fiefs was usurpation. Under the later Carolingians the counts, dukes, marquises, and other royal officers, who were at first simply appointed magistrates, succeeded, by taking advantage of the weakness of their sovereigns, in making their offices hereditary, and then in having their duchies, counties, and provinces regarded as fiefs granted to them by the king. By the year 877 this process had proceeded so far that in that year Charles the Bald of France, by the celebrated capitulary

[8] Under the name, however, of *emphyteusis*.

of Kiersy, recognized the hereditary character of the offices of his counts. In this way the countries originally embraced within the limits of the empire of Charles the Great became broken up into a considerable number of enormous fiefs, the heads of which, bearing the names of count, duke, marquis, and so on, became the great vassals of the crown.

Another way in which fiefs arose was through the owners of allodial estates voluntarily surrendering them into the hands of some powerful lord, and then receiving them back as benefices, or fiefs. We shall see, a little further on, how the confusion and anarchy of the ninth and tenth centuries caused multitudes of allodial proprietors thus to turn their freeholds into fiefs, that they might thereby come within the feudal system and enjoy its advantages and protection.

145. Origin of the Feudal Patronage. — We named the close personal tie uniting the lord and his vassal as the second of the essential features of the feudal system. Some have traced this to the Teutons, and think it the same tie as that which bound the companion to his chief and created the ancient German institution known as the *comitatus* (par. 12). Others have pronounced it identical with the tie that at Rome bound the client to his patron. Still others have traced it to the Celtic or Gallic custom of commendation, whereby a person subjected himself to a more powerful lord for the sake of his patronage and protection. All these things indeed are very much alike, and any one might have served as the germ out of which feudal patronage, the special relation of lord and vassal, was developed.

The important thing to bear in mind, however, is that in the Frankish kingdom, which was the cradle of feudalism, we find all the officers of the court and the great men of the nation holding to the king relations of sworn fidelity and trust which were in various respects analogous to the relations that subsisted in earlier times between the German war leader and his companions.

Now in time this peculiar personal relation, characterized on the part of the vassal by pledges of fealty, service, and aid, and on the part of the lord by promise of counsel and protection, came to be united with the benefice, with which at first it had nothing to do. The union of these two ties completed the feudal tenure.

146. Origin of the Feudal Sovereignty. — It still remains to speak of the feudal sovereignty. How did the possessor of a beneficiary estate, or fief, acquire the rights of a sovereign over the persons living upon it, — the right to administer justice, to coin money, and to wage war? How did these privileges and authorities which at first resided in the king come to be distributed among the fief-holders? In two ways chiefly, — by the king's voluntary surrender of his rights and powers, and by usurpation.

Thus the Merovingian and Carolingian rulers very frequently conferred upon churches, monasteries, and important personages a portion of the royal power. This was done by what were known as *grants of immunity*.[4] Thus a monastery, for instance, would, by such a grant, be freed from royal interference, and given administrative authority over all classes of persons living upon its lands. In this way the royal authority was much scattered and weakened.

A still more important source of feudal sovereignty was the usurpation of the kingly power by the royal officers. Under the later Carolingians these magistrates, as we have already seen, succeeded in making their offices hereditary, and thus transformed themselves into petty sovereigns, only nominally dependent upon their king. They became powerful vassals,

[4] A grant of immunity may for purposes of illustration be compared to the charter granted by the modern state to the board of directors of a college or other corporation, whereby are conferred upon this body limited rights of legislation and jurisdiction; or a better illustration perhaps would be the Constitution that the United States Government by its ratification gives to a Territory and thereby makes it a State with many sovereign powers. Federalism indeed presents various instructive analogies to feudalism.

while their sovereign became a suzerain, a shadow-king. By such usurpations the kingdoms into which the empire of Charles the Great was at first broken became still further subdivided into numerous petty feudal principalities, and the royal power was distributed down through the ranks of a more or less perfectly graduated civil hierarchy.

147. **The Ceremony of Homage.** —A fief was conferred by a very solemn and peculiar ceremony called *homage*. The person about to become a vassal, kneeling with uncovered head, placed his hands in those of his future lord, and solemnly vowed to be henceforth his man,[5] and to serve him faithfully even with his life. This part of the ceremony, sealed with a kiss, was what properly constituted the ceremony of homage. It was accompanied by an oath of fealty, and the whole was concluded by the act of investiture, whereby the lord put his vassal in actual possession of the land, or by placing in his hand a clod of earth or a twig, symbolized the delivery to him of the estate for which he had just now done homage and sworn fealty.

148. **The Relations of Lord and Vassal.** — In general terms the duty of the vassal was service; that of the lord, protection. The most honorable service required of the vassal, and the one most willingly rendered in a martial age, was military aid. The liegeman must always be ready to follow his lord upon his military expeditions; but the time of service for one year was usually not more than forty days. He must defend his lord in battle; if he should be unhorsed, must give him his own animal; and, if he should be made a prisoner, must offer himself as a hostage for his release. He must also give entertainment to his lord and his retinue on their journeys.

There were other incidents mainly of a financial nature attaching to a fief, which grew up gradually and did not become a part of the system much before the eleventh

[5] Latin *homo*, whence "homage."

century. These were known as *reliefs*, *fines upon alienation*, *escheats*, and *aids*.

A Relief was the name given to the sum of money which an heir upon coming into possession of a fief must pay to the lord of the domain. This was often a large amount, being usually the entire revenue of the estate for one year.

A Fine upon Alienation was a sum of money paid to the lord by a vassal for permission to alienate his fief, that is, to substitute another vassal in his place.

By Escheat was meant the falling back of the fief into the hands of the lord through failure of heirs. If the fief lapsed through disloyalty or other misdemeanor on the part of the vassal, this was known as *forfeiture*.

Aids were sums of money which the lord had a right to demand to enable him to meet unusual expenditures, especially for defraying the expense of knighting his eldest son, for providing a marriage dower for his eldest daughter, and for ransoming his own person from captivity in case he were made a prisoner of war.[6]

The chief return that the lord was bound to make to the vassal as a compensation for these various services and rights was counsel and protection — by no means a small return in an age of turmoil and insecurity.

149. Serfs[7] and Serfdom. — The vassals, or fief-holders, of various grades constituted only a very small portion, perhaps five per cent or less, of the population of the countries where

[6] The right of wardship was the right of the lord, when the successor to a fief was a minor, to assume the guardianship of the heir and to enjoy the revenues of the fief until his ward became of age. The right of marriage was the right of the lord to select a husband for his female ward, "lest he should get an enemy for a vassal."

[7] The terms "serf" and "villain," although in some countries they denoted different classes, are used interchangeably by many writers. Thus English writers usually employ the terms "villains" and "villainage" in speaking of the servile English peasantry after the Norman Conquest. We shall, however, throughout our work use the words "serf" and "serfdom" only in the sense defined in the present paragraph.

feudalism came to prevail. The great bulk of the folk were agricultural serfs.[8] These were the men who actually tilled the soil.

Just how this servile class arose is not positively known. Some think that the ancestors of the mediæval serfs were bondsmen, others that they were, speaking generally, freemen. In some countries at least they seem to have been the lineal descendants of the slaves of Roman times, whose condition had been gradually ameliorated. But setting aside this vexed question of origin, we need for our present purpose simply to regard serfdom as that form of servitude which the moral feelings and the economic conditions of the mediæval time permitted or created.

The serfs were what we might term servile tenants. Their status varied greatly from country to country and from period to period; that is to say, there came to be many grades of serfs filling the space between the actual slave and the full freeman. Consequently it is impossible to give any general account of the class which can be regarded as a true picture of their actual condition as a body at any given time. The following description must therefore be taken as reflecting their duties and disabilities only in the most general way.

The first and most characteristic feature of the condition of the serfs was that they were affixed to the soil. They could not of their own will leave the estate or manor to which they belonged; nor, on the other hand, could their lord deprive them of their holdings and set them adrift. When the land changed masters they passed with it, just like a "rooted tree or stone earth-bound." It was this that constituted the peasants serfs in the sense in which we shall use the term.

[8] There were some free peasants and a larger number of free artisans and traders, inhabitants of the towns. The number of actual slaves was small. They had almost all disappeared before the end of the tenth century, either having been emancipated or been lifted into the lowest order of serfs, which was an advance toward freedom. At the time of the great Domesday survey (par. 172) there were, according to this record, only about 25,000 slaves in England.

Each serf had allotted him by his lord a cottage and a number of acres of land — thirty acres formed a normal holding — in the great open fields of the manor. For these he paid a rent, usually during the earlier feudal times in kind and in personal services. The personal services included a certain number of days' work, usually two or three days each week, on the demesne, that is, the land which the lord had kept in his own hands as a sort of home farm. The nature of the work consisted in ploughing the lord's land, tilling and weeding his crops, ditching, building walls, repairing roads and bridges, cutting and hauling wood to the manor house, washing and shearing sheep, feeding the hounds, and picking nuts and wild berries for the folk in the castle. Often the poor serf could find time to till his own little plot only on moonlit nights or on rainy days. He must furthermore grind his grain at his lord's mill, press his grapes at his wine-press, bake his bread at his oven, often paying for these services an unreasonable toll.[9]

After the serf had rendered to the lord all the rent in kind he owed for his cottage and bit of ground, the remainder of the produce from his fields was, in accordance with custom if not always with law, his own. Generally the share was only just sufficient to keep the wolf of hunger from his door. Some serfs, however, were able to accumulate considerable personal property, enough wherewith to purchase their freedom.

In some countries upon the death of the serf all that he had became in the eye of the law the property of his lord; in other lands again, the lord could take only the best animal or the best implement of the deceased serf. This was called the heriot.

Besides all these payments, services, gifts, and dues, there were often others of a whimsical and teasing rather than an oppressive nature. But of these we need not now speak.

[9] In the beginning all these things were intended for the advantage of the *serf, but* as time passed they became oppressive monopolies and agencies of *extortion.*

What we have already said will convey some idea of the nature of the relations that existed between the lord and his serf, and will indicate how servile and burdensome were the incidents of the tenure by which the serf held his cottage and bit of ground. How the serf gradually freed himself from the heavy yoke of his servitude and became a freeman will appear as we advance in our narrative.

150. Development of the Feudal System. — Although the germs of feudalism may be found in the society of the fifth or sixth century, still the system did not develop so as to exhibit its characteristic features before the eighth or ninth.

What greatly contributed to the development of feudalism, particularly on its military side, was the means adopted by Charles Martel, after the battle of Tours, to repel the continued raids of the Arab horsemen into Southern Gaul. Foot-soldiers being useless in the pursuit of the mounted marauders, Charles created a cavalry force, appropriating for this purpose church lands which he granted in fief to meet the cost of service on horseback. This was the opening of the day of feudal chivalry (par. 156). Gradually the old general levies of foot-soldiers were almost wholly superseded by arrays of feudal knights.

This development of feudalism as a defensive military system and in the typical form which it had now assumed in the Gallic border land between Saracen and Christian was hastened by the disturbed state of society everywhere during the greater part of the ninth and the tenth century; for after the death of Charles the Great and the partition of his empire among his feeble successors, it appeared as though the world were again falling back into chaos. The bonds of society seemed entirely broken. Every man did that which was right in his own eyes.

To internal disorders were added the invasions of the outside barbarians; for, no longer held in restraint by the strong arm of the great Charles, they had now begun their raids anew. From the north came the Scandinavian pirates to harry

the shores of Germany, Gaul, and Britain. The terror which these pagan sea-rovers inspired is commemorated by the supplication of the litany of those days: "From the fury of the Northmen, good Lord, deliver us." From the east came the terrible Hungarians. These pagan marauders not only devastated Germany but troubled Southern France, and passing the Alps, spread before them a terror like that which had run before the Huns nearly five hundred years earlier.

By the way of the sea on the south came an equally dreaded foe. The Saracens, now intrenched in Spain and Sicily, made piratical descents upon all the Christian shores of the Western and Middle Mediterranean, sacking and burning, and creating here such panic and dismay as the Northmen and Hungarians were creating by their irruptions in the north and east.

It was this anarchical state of things that, as we have said, caused the rapid development of feudalism. All classes of society hastened to enter the system, in order to secure the protection which it alone could afford.

Kings, princes, and wealthy persons who had large landed possessions which they had never parceled out as fiefs, were now led to do so, that their estates might be held by tenants bound to protect them by all the sacred obligations of homage and fealty. Thus sovereigns and princes became suzerains and feudal lords. Again, the smaller proprietors who held their estates by allodial tenure voluntarily surrendered them into the hands of some neighboring lord, and then received them back again from him as fiefs, that they might claim protection as vassals. They deemed this better than being robbed of their property altogether.

Moreover, for like reasons and in like manner, churches, monasteries, and cities became members of the feudal system. They granted out their vast possessions as fiefs, and thus became suzerains and lords. Bishops and abbots became the heads of great bands of retainers, and often themselves led military *expeditions like* temporal chiefs. On the other hand, these

same monasteries and towns frequently placed themselves under the protection of some powerful lord, and thus came in vassalage to him. Sometimes the bishops and the heads of religious houses, instead of paying military service, bound themselves to say a certain number of Masses for the lord or his family. Lewis the Pious, son and successor of Charles the Great, decreed that with some exceptions all the monasteries of his empire should hold their estates on the sole condition "that they should pray for the welfare of the emperor and his children and the empire."

In this way were Church and State, all classes of society from the wealthiest suzerain to the humblest vassal, bound together by feudal ties. Everything was impressed with the stamp of feudalism.

151. Castles of the Nobles. — The lawless and violent character of the times during which feudalism prevailed is well shown by the nature of the residences which the nobles built for themselves. These were strong stone fortresses, usually perched upon some rocky eminence, and defended by moats and towers.

France, Germany, Italy, Northern Spain, England, and Scotland, in which countries the feudal system became most thoroughly developed, fairly bristled with these fortified residences of the nobility. Strong walls were the only protection against the universal violence of the age. Not only had each lord to protect himself against the attacks of neighboring chiefs, but also against those of foreign foes, such as the Hungarians and the Northmen; for there was no strong central authority to make law respected and to give protection to all.

One of the most striking and picturesque features of the landscape of many regions in Europe at the present time is the ivy-mantled towers and walls of these feudal castles, now falling into ruins. They are impressive memorials of an age that has *passed away*.

152. Sports of the Nobles; Hunting and Hawking. — When not engaged in military enterprises, the nobles occupied their time in hunting and hawking. We have learned from their own inscriptions and sculptures how favorite a royal sport was hunting among the Egyptians, Assyrians, and other Eastern peoples. Our Teutonic ancestors held the diversion in even greater esteem. "With the northern barbarians," writes Hallam, "it was rather a predominant appetite than an amusement; it was their pride and their ornament, the theme of their songs, the object of their laws, and the business of their lives." It was the forest laws of the Norman conquerors of England, designed for the protection of the game in the royal preserves, which, perhaps more than anything else, caused these foreign rulers to be so hated by the English (par. 173).

Abbots and bishops entered upon the chase with as great zest as the lay nobles. Even the prohibitions of church councils against the clergy's indulging in such worldly amusements were wholly ineffectual.

Hawking grew into a very passion among all classes, even ladies participating in the sport. In the celebrated tapestries and upon all the monuments of the feudal age, the greyhound and the falcon, the dog lying at the feet of his master and the bird perched upon his wrist, are, after the knightly sword and armor, the most common emblems of nobility.

153. Causes of the Decay of Feudalism. — As feudalism was several centuries in coming to maturity, so was it also a number of centuries in dying. It was, as we have already said, at its height, that is, its principles and forms dominated society most completely, during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. Even before the close of the thirteenth century it had, in some countries, begun to decay.

Chief among the various causes which undermined and at length overthrew feudalism were the hostility to the system of the kings and the common people, the Crusades, the

growth of the cities, and the introduction of firearms in the art of war.

The feudal system was hated and opposed by both the royal power and the people. In fact it was never regarded with much favor by any class save the nobles, who enjoyed its advantages at the expense of all the other orders of society. Kings opposed it and sought to break it down, because it left them only the semblance of power. We shall see later how the kings came again by their own (chap. xix).

The common people always hated it for the reason that under it they were regarded of less value than the game in the lord's hunting park. The record of their struggles for recognition in society and a participation in the privileges of the haughty feudal aristocracy, — struggles which remind us of the contest between the plebeians and patricians in ancient Rome, — form the most interesting and instructive portions of mediæval and even of later history.

The Crusades, or Holy Wars, that agitated all Europe during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries did much to weaken the power of the nobles; for in order to raise money for their expeditions they frequently sold or mortgaged their estates, and in this way power and influence passed into the hands of the kings or the wealthy merchants of the cities. Many of the great nobles also perished in battle with the infidels, and their lands escheated to their suzerain, whose domains were thus augmented.

The growth of the towns also tended to the same end. As they increased in wealth and influence, they became able to resist the exactions and tyranny of the lord in whose fief they happened to be, and eventually were able to secede, as it were, from his authority, and to make of themselves little republics.

Again, improvements and changes in the mode of warfare, especially those resulting from the use of gunpowder, hastened the downfall of feudalism, by rendering the yeoman foot-soldier equal to the armor-clad knight. "It made all men of the

same height," as Carlyle puts it. The people with muskets in their hands could assert and make good their rights. And the castle, the body of feudalism; that in which it lived and moved and had its being, now became a useless thing. Its walls might bid defiance to the mounted, steel-clad baron and his retainers, but they could offer little protection against well-trained artillery.

But it is to be carefully noted that, though feudalism as a system of government disappeared, speaking broadly, with the Middle Ages,[10] it still continued to exist as a social organization. The nobles lost their power and authority as petty sovereigns, but retained their titles, their privileges, their social distinction, and, in many cases, their vast landed estates.

154. Defects of the Feudal System. — Feudalism was perhaps the best form of social organization that it was possible to maintain in Europe during the mediæval period; yet it had many and serious defects, which rendered it very far from being a perfect social or political system. Among its chief faults may be pointed out the two following:

First, it rendered impossible the formation of strong national governments. Every country was divided and subdivided into a vast number of practically independent principalities. Thus, in the tenth century France was partitioned among about a hundred and fifty overlords, all exercising equal and coördinate powers of sovereignty. The enormous estates of these great lords were again subdivided into about seventy thousand smaller fiefs.

[10] Different events and circumstances marked the decline and extinction of feudalism in the various countries of Europe (see chap. xix). In England it was the contention for the crown, known as the Wars of the Roses (1455–1485), in which many of the nobility were killed or ruined in estate, that gave the death-blow to the institution there. The ruin of the system in France may be dated from the establishment of a regular standing army by Charles VII (in 1448). The rubbish of the institution, however, was not cleared away in that country until the great Revolution of 1789. In Spain the feudal aristocracy *received their* death-blow at the hands of Ferdinand and Isabella, in the latter *part of the fifteenth* century.

In theory, as we have seen, the holders of these petty estates were bound to serve and obey their overlords, and these great nobles were in turn the sworn vassals of the French king. But many of these lords were richer and stronger than the king himself, and if they chose to cast off their allegiance to him, he found it impossible to reduce them to obedience. In a word, France, — and the same was true of all other countries in which the feudal system prevailed, — instead of being a nation with a sovereign at its head having authority and power to compel obedience throughout his dominions, was simply a very loose league of more than a hundred practically sovereign states, held together by ties that could be broken almost with impunity. The king's time was chiefly occupied in ineffectual efforts to reduce his haughty and refractory nobles to proper submission, and in intervening feebly to compose their endless quarrels with one another. It is easy to conceive the disorder and wretchedness produced by this state of things.

A second evil of the institution was its exclusiveness. Under the workings of the system society became divided into classes separated by lines which, though not impassable, were yet very rigid, with a proud hereditary aristocracy at its head. It was only as the lower classes in the different countries gradually wrested from the feudal nobility their special and unfair privileges that a better, because more democratic, form of society arose, and civilization began to make more rapid progress.

155. The Good Results of Feudalism. — The most conspicuous service that feudalism rendered European civilization was the protection which it gave to society after the break-up of the empire of Charles the Great. "It was the mailed feudal horseman and the impregnable walls of the feudal castle that foiled the attacks of the Danes, the Saracens, and the Hungarians." [11]

Feudalism rendered another noteworthy service to society in fostering among its privileged members that individualism, that love of personal independence, which we have seen to be

[11] Oman's *The Dark Ages*, p. 512.

a marked trait of the Teutonic character (par. 10). Turbulent, violent, and refractory as was the feudal aristocracy of Europe, it performed the grand service of keeping alive during the later mediæval period the spirit of liberty. The feudal lords would not allow themselves to be dealt with arrogantly by their king; they stood on their rights as freemen. Hence royalty was prevented from becoming as despotic as it would otherwise have become. Thus in England, for instance, the feudal lords held such tyrannical rulers as King John in check (par. 314), until such time as the yeoman and the burgher were bold enough and strong enough alone to resist their despotically inclined sovereigns. In France, where, unfortunately, the power of the feudal nobles was broken too soon, — before the burghers of the towns, the Third Estate, were prepared to take up the struggle for liberty, — the result was the growth of that autocratic, despotic royalty which led the French people to the Revolution and the Reign of Terror.

Another of the good effects of feudalism was the impulse it gave to certain forms of polite literature. Just as learning and philosophy were fostered by the seclusion of the cloister, so were poetry and romance fostered by the open and joyous hospitalities of the baronial hall. The castle door was always open to the wandering singer and story-teller, and it was amidst the scenes of festivity within that the ballads and romances of mediæval minstrelsy and literature had their birth. "It is to the feudal times," says Guizot, "that we trace back the earliest literary monuments of England, France, and Germany, the earliest intellectual enjoyments of modern Europe."

Still another service which feudalism rendered to civilization was the development within the baronial castle of those ideas and sentiments — among others, a nice sense of honor and an exalted consideration for woman — which found their noblest expression in Chivalry, of which institution and its *good* effects upon the social life of Europe we shall now *proceed to speak.*

II. Chivalry

156. Chivalry defined; Origin of the Institution. — Chivalry has been aptly defined as the "Flower of Feudalism." It was a military institution or order, the members of which, called *knights*, were pledged to the protection of the Church and to the defense of the weak and the oppressed.

The germ out of which chivalry developed seems to have been the body of vassal horsemen which Charles Martel created to repel the raids of the Saracens into Aquitaine (par. 150). It was in these border wars that the Franks learned from the Arab Moors "to put their trust in horses." From South France this new military system, in which mounted armor-clad warriors largely superseded the earlier foot-soldiers, spread over Europe.[12]

The development was closely connected with the development of feudalism; indeed, it was the military side of that development. It became the rule that all fief-holders must render military service on horseback. Fighting on horseback gradually became the normal mode and for centuries remained so.

Gradually this feudal warrior caste underwent a transformation. It became in part independent of the feudal system, in so far as that had to do with the land, so that any person, if qualified by birth and properly initiated, might be a member of the order without being the holder of a fief. A great part of the later knights were portionless sons of the nobility.

At the same time the religious spirit of the period entered into the order, and it became a Christian brotherhood, somewhat like the order of the priesthood. Thus, like all other mediæval institutions, chivalry resulted from a union of various elements. Its military forms, spirit, and virtues came from the side of feudalism; its religious forms, spirit, and virtues,

[12] See Brunner, *Der Reiterdienst und die Anfänge des Lehnwesens* in his *Forschungen zur Geschichte des deutschen und französischen Rechtes* (Stuttgart, 1894). This important study is of the nature of a discovery respecting the beginnings, or rather the development, of the fief system and of chivalry.

from the side of the Church. What actually took place is best illustrated by those military orders of monks, the Knights Templars and the Knights Hospitallers, which came into existence during the Crusades. But notwithstanding their monkish vows of celibacy and poverty, we probably shall not be wrong if we regard these monk-knights as the virtual descendants of those warriors whom Charles Martel gave fiefs and put on horses to repel the plundering incursions of the "swift Moors."

157. Its Universality; the Church and Chivalry.—As France was the cradle, so was it the true home, of chivalry. Yet its influence was felt everywhere and in everything. It colored all the events and enterprises of the latter half of the Middle Ages. The literature of the period is instinct with its spirit. The Crusades, the greatest undertakings of the mediæval ages, were primarily enterprises of the Christian chivalry of Europe; for chivalry had then come under the tutelage of the Church. In the year 1095 the Council of Clermont, which assembly formally inaugurated the First Crusade, decreed that every person of noble birth, on attaining the age of twelve, should take a solemn oath before a bishop "that he would defend to the uttermost the oppressed, the widow, and the orphan; and that women of noble birth should enjoy his special care."

158. Training of the Knight.—When chivalry had once become established, all the sons of the nobility, save such as were to enter the holy orders of the Church, were set apart and disciplined for its service. The sons of the poorer nobles were usually placed in the family of some lord of renown and wealth, whose castle became a sort of school, where they were trained in the duties and exercises of knighthood.

This education began at the early age of seven, the youth bearing the name of page or varlet until he attained the age of fourteen, when he acquired the title of squire, or esquire. The lord and his knights trained the boys in manly and martial duties, while the ladies of the castle instructed them in the *duties of religion* and in all knightly etiquette. The duties

of the page were usually confined to the castle, though sometimes he accompanied his lord to the field. The esquire always attended in battle the knight to whom he was attached, carrying his arms and, if need be, engaging in the fight.

159. The Ceremony of Knighting. — At the age of twenty-one the squire became a knight, being then introduced to the order of knighthood by a peculiar and impressive service. After a long fast and vigil, the candidate listened to a lengthy sermon on his duties as a knight. Then kneeling, as in the feudal ceremony of homage, before the lord conducting the services, he vowed to defend religion and the ladies, to succor the distressed, and ever to be faithful to his companion knights. His arms were now given to him, and his sword was girded on, when the lord, striking him with the flat of his sword on the shoulders or on the neck, said, "In the name of God, of Saint Michael, and of Saint George, I dub thee knight; be brave, bold, and loyal."

160. The Tournament. — The tournament was the favorite amusement of the age of chivalry. It was a mimic battle between two companies of noble knights, armed usually with pointless swords or blunted lances. In the universal esteem in which the participants were held, it reminds us of the sacred games of the Greeks; while in the fierce and sanguinary character it sometimes assumed, it recalls the gladiatorial combats of the Roman amphitheater.

The prince or baron giving the festival made wide proclamation of the event, brave and distinguished knights being invited even from distant lands to grace the occasion with their presence and an exhibition of their skill and prowess. The lists — a level space marked off by a rope or railing, and surrounded with galleries for spectators — were made gay with banners and tapestries and heraldic emblems.

When the moment arrived for the opening of the ceremony, heralds proclaimed the rules of the contest, whereupon the combatants advanced into the lists, each knight displaying

upon his helmet or breast the device of the mistress of his affections. At the given signal the opposing parties of knights, with couched lances, rode fiercely at each other. Victory was accorded to him who unhorsed his antagonist, or broke in a proper manner the greatest number of lances. The rewards to the victor consisted of jewels, gifts of armor, or horses decked with knightly trappings, and, more esteemed than all else, the praises and favor of his lady-love.

The tournament continued to be a favorite diversion even after the spirit of chivalry began to decline in Europe. One thing that tended to bring the amusement into disfavor was the fatal accidents that frequently marred the knightly encounter. In 1559 Henry II of France was killed by a splintered lance while participating in a tournament, and this event did much towards effecting a virtual abolition of the rude sport. But the amusement, like the national games of the ancient Greeks and Romans, had too strong a hold upon the affections and imagination of the age to become obsolete at once. "The world long clung with fondness to these splendid and graceful shows which had thrown light and elegance over the warriors and dames of yore."

The Joust[18] differed from the tournament in being an encounter between two knights only, and in being attended with less ceremony.

161. Character of the Knight. — Chivalric loyalty to the mistress of his supreme affection was the first article in the creed of the true knight. "He who was faithful and true to his lady," says Hallam, "was held sure of salvation in the theology of castles, though not of Christians." He must also be gentle, brave, courteous, truthful, pure, generous, hospitable,

[18] "If the combatants were allowed to use sharp weapons, and to put forth all their force and skill against one another, this was the *joute à l'outrance*, and was of frequent enough occurrence." — CUTTS, *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages.* "The combat at outrance was, in fact, a duel, and only differed from the trial by battle [par. 58] in being voluntary, while the other was enforced by law." — JAMES, *History of Chivalry.*

faithful to his engagements, and ever ready to risk life and limb in the cause of religion and in defense of his companions in arms.

But these were the virtues and qualifications of the ideal knight. It is needless to say that, though there were many who illustrated all these virtues in their blameless lives and romantic enterprises, there were too many who were knights only in profession. "An errant knight," as an old writer puns, with too much truth, "was an arrant knave." Another writer says, "Deeds that would disgrace a thief, and acts of cruelty that would have disgusted a Hellenic tyrant or a Roman emperor, were common things with knights of the highest lineage."

But cruelty, treachery, untruthfulness, cowardice, baseness, and crime of every sort were opposed to the true spirit of chivalry; and the knight who was convicted of such faults could be punished by expulsion from the order of knighthood, by what was known as the Ceremony of Degradation. In this ceremony the spurs of the offending knight were struck off from his heels with a heavy cleaver, his sword was broken, and his horse's tail cut off. Then the disgraced knight was dressed in a burial robe, and the usual funeral ceremonies were performed over him, signifying that he was "dead to the honors of knighthood."

162. Decline of Chivalry. — The fifteenth century was the evening of chivalry. The decline of the system resulted from the operation of the same causes that effected the overthrow of feudalism. The changes in the mode of warfare which helped to do away with the feudal baron and his mail-clad retainers likewise tended to destroy knight-errantry. And then, as civilization advanced, new feelings and sentiments began to claim the attention and to work upon the imagination of men. Persons ambitious of distinction began to seek it in other ways than by adventures of chivalry. Governments, too, became more regular, and the increased order and

security of society rendered less needful the services of the gallant knight in behalf of the weak and the oppressed.

In a word, the extravagant performances of the knight-errant carried into a practical and commercial age — an age very different from that which gave birth to chivalry — became fantastic and ridiculous; and when, finally, early in the seventeenth century, the genial Spanish satirist Cervantes wrote his famous *Don Quixote*, in which work he leads his hero-knight into all sorts of absurd adventures, such as running a tilt against a windmill, which his excited imagination had pictured to be a monstrous giant flourishing his arms with some wicked intent, everybody, struck with the infinite absurdity of the thing, fell a-laughing; and amidst the fitting accompaniment of smiles and broad pleasantries the knight-errant took his departure from the world.[14]

163. The Evil and the Good in Chivalry. — "For the mind," James affirms, "chivalry did little; for the heart it did everything." Doubtless we must qualify the latter part of this statement. While it is true that chivalry, as we shall in a moment maintain, did much for the heart, its influences upon it were not altogether good. The system had many vices, chief among which were its aristocratic, exclusive tendencies. Dr. Arnold, indignant among other things at the knights' forgetfulness or disregard of the brotherhood of man, exclaims bitterly, "If I were called upon to name what spirit of evil predominantly deserved the name of Antichrist, I should name the Spirit of Chivalry." And another indignant writer declares that "it is not probable that the knights supposed they could be guilty of injustice to the lower classes." These were regarded with indifference or contempt, and considered as destitute of any claims upon those of noble birth as were

[14] That is, from the world of romantic literature; for the satire of Cervantes was aimed at the extravagances of the romancers of his times. (Recall Spenser's *The Faery Queene.*) There were not many *real* knights-errant when Cervantes wrote.

beasts of burden or the game of the chase. It is always the young and beautiful woman of *gentle* birth whose wrongs the valiant knight is risking his life to avenge, always the smiles of the queen of love and beauty for which he is splintering his lance in the fierce tournament. The fostering of this aristocratic spirit was one of the most serious faults of chivalry. Yet we must bear in mind that this fault should be charged to the age as much as to the knight.

But to speak of the beneficial, refining influences of chivalry, we should say that it undoubtedly contributed powerfully to lift that sentiment of respect for the gentler sex which characterized all the northern nations, into that tender veneration of woman which forms the distinguishing characteristic of the present age, and makes it to differ from all preceding phases of civilization.

Again, chivalry did much to create that ideal of character — an ideal distinguished by the virtues of courtesy, gentleness, humanity, loyalty, magnanimity, and fidelity to the plighted word — which we rightly think to surpass any ever formed under the influences of antiquity. Just as Christianity gave to the world an ideal manhood which it was to strive to realize, so did chivalry hold up an ideal to which men were to conform their lives. Men, indeed, have never perfectly realized either the ideal of Christianity or that of chivalry; but the influence which these two ideals have had in shaping and giving character to the lives of men cannot be overestimated. Together, through the enthusiasm and effort awakened for their realization, they have produced a new type of manhood, which we indicate by the phrase "a knightly and Christian character."

Sources and Source Material. — *Translations and Reprints* (Univ. of Penn.), vol. iii, No. 5, "English Manorial Documents," and vol. iv, No. 3, "Documents Illustrative of Feudalism."

Secondary or Modern Works. — GUIZOT (F. P. G.), *History of Civilization in Europe* (edited, with critical and supplementary notes, by George Wells Knight: New York, 1896), lect. iv, ** "The Feudal

System." Also the same author's *History of Civilization in France* (trans. by William Hazlitt), vols. ii and iii, lects. i–xi (Second Course). The lectures of Guizot present a singularly clear and interesting account of feudalism. In some parts, however, they have been superseded by later investigations. EMERTON (E.), ***Introduction to the Middle Ages*, chap. xv; and the same author's *Mediæval Europe*, chap. xiv and the first part of chap. xv. These chapters should be read in connection with the lectures by Guizot. ADAMS (G. B.), *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. ix, ** "The Feudal System." KITCHIN (G. W.), *History of France*, vol. i, bk. iii, chap. iv, "Of Feudalism and Chivalry." HALLAM (H.), *The Middle Ages*, chap. ii, "The Feudal System, especially in France." Must be read in connection with later authorities. SEEBOHM (F.), ***The English Village Community*. This is the most noteworthy work in our language on the subject with which it deals. The author seeks the origin of the English manor in the Roman villa with its servile population, thus making English history begin with servitude and not with freedom. MAITLAND (F. W.), *Domesday Book and Beyond*. A book for the use of advanced students. Maitland, opposing Mr. Seebohm's view as to the servile origin of the manor, believes that, speaking generally, the villages in early Saxon times were not Celtic or Roman communities of slaves or coloni, but purely German communities of free men. CHEYNEY (E. P.), *An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England*, chap. ii, ** "Rural Life and Organization." ASHLEY (W. J.), *An Introduction to English Economic History and Theory* ("The Middle Ages"), chap. i, "The Manor and Village Community." VINOGRADOFF (P.), *Villainage in England: Essays in English Mediæval History*. OMAN (C.), *The Dark Ages*. The last few pages (511–514) are very suggestive. Also by the same author, *A History of the Art of War* ("The Middle Ages"). Particularly books iii and v. An earlier work by Oman, entitled *The Art of War in the Middle Ages*, includes the fifteenth century, which is not covered by his later history, so far as yet published. CUTTS (E. L.), *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1885), pp. 311–460, "Knights of the Middle Ages." JAMES (G. P. R.), *History of Chivalry*. MILLS (C.), *The History of Chivalry*.

CHAPTER XI

THE NORMANS

I. The Normans at Home and in Italy

164. Introductory. — The history of the Normans — the name, it will be recalled, of the transformed Scandinavians who settled in Northern Gaul (par. 126) — is simply a continuation of the story of the Northmen; and nothing could better illustrate the difference between the period we have left behind and the one upon which we have entered, nothing could more strikingly exhibit the gradual transformation that has crept over the face and spirit of European society, than the transformation which time and favoring associations have wrought in these men. When first we met them in the ninth century they were pagans; now they are Christians. Then they were rough, wild, merciless corsairs; now they are become the most cultured, polished, and chivalrous people in Europe. But the restless, daring spirit that drove the Norse sea-kings forth upon the waves in quest of adventure and booty still stirs in the breasts of their descendants. As has been said, they were simply changed from heathen Vikings, delighting in the wild life of sea-rover and pirate, into Christian knights, eager for pilgrimages and crusades.

It is these men, uniting in their character the strength, independence, and daring of the Scandinavian with the vivacity, imagination, and culture of the Romano-Gaul, that we are now to follow, as from their seats in France they go forth to make fresh conquests, — to build up a kingdom in the Mediterranean lands, *and to set a line* of Norman kings upon the English

throne. Later, in following the fortunes of the crusaders, we shall meet them on the battlefields of Palestine, there winning renown as the most valiant knights of Christendom.

165. The Dukes of Normandy. — Under Rollo (par. 125) and his immediate successors — William Longsword (927–943), Richard the Fearless (943–996), and Richard the Good (996–1027) — the power of the Normans in France became gradually consolidated. The country of Normandy grew more populous, both through the natural increase of the population at home and the arrival of fresh bands of Scandinavians from the northern countries. Finally, after more than one hundred years had passed, years for the most part of uneventful yet steady growth and development, the old Norse spirit of adventure revived, and Southern Europe and England became the scene of the daring and brilliant exploits of the Norman warriors.

166. The Normans in Italy and Sicily. — The Normans secured a foothold in Southern Italy in the early part of the eleventh century, some little time before the conquest of England. Their superior fighting qualities had led to their services being sought after by the Christian rulers of that region in their constant feuds with each other, and particularly in their warfare against the Moslems, who at that time were in possession of the island of Sicily, and were constantly troubling the neighboring shores of Italy.

From the position of guests and mercenaries the Norman knights soon rose to that of masters and rulers. They got possession finally of all Southern Italy and of Sicily, and built up in these southern lands a prosperous state, which came to be known as the Kingdom of Naples, and which lasted, although with many changes of dynasties, until the political unification of Italy in our own day.

The most celebrated of the Norman leaders during this period of conquest and organization was Robert Guiscard *(d. 1085)*, a character only less celebrated than the renowned *William the Conqueror*, of whom we shall come to speak

presently. His entire career was one series of daring and adventurous exploits, which spread the renown of the Norman name throughout the Mediterranean lands.

One of the most important consequences of the creation of this new Norman state in the south was its effect upon the Crusades, to the eve of which we have now come. These Norman rulers built up a strong maritime power, which had the great port of Amalfi as its center, and, with the help of the fleets of Genoa, Pisa, and Venice, cleared the Middle Mediterranean of Saracen corsairs, thus opening up for the coming crusaders a water route to the Holy Land.

II. The Norman Conquest of England

167. Events leading up to the Conquest. — The conquest of England by the Normans was the most important of their enterprises, and one followed by consequences of the greatest magnitude, not only to the conquered people, but indirectly to the world.

In the year 1035 the duke of the Normans, known as Robert the Magnificent (1027–1035), died in Asia Minor, while on his way home from a romantic pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and his son William, called the Bastard, the destined conqueror of England, became the duke of Normandy. William was at this time only seven years of age.

Before setting out on his pilgrimage, Robert had persuaded the Norman nobles to swear fealty to his son in case he himself should not return; but the oath of the proud lords was not strong enough to bind their allegiance to the boy of disgraceful birth. For twelve years the duchy was torn with contentions between the young duke and his rebellious vassals. But the valor, genius, and good fortune of William finally triumphed over all opposition and difficulties, and he succeeded in establishing his undisputed authority throughout Normandy. The cruelty with which he punished those of his enemies that

had especially awakened his resentment indicated the stern and unrelenting character of the man whom destiny had selected to play a most important part in the history of the eleventh century.

We must now notice the situation of affairs in England. In the year 1066 died Edward the Confessor, in whose person, it will be recalled, the old English line was restored after the Danish usurpation (par. 123), and immediately the Witan, in accordance with the dying wish of the king, chose Harold, earl of Wessex, son of the famous Godwin, and the best and strongest man in all England, to be his successor.

When the news of the action of the Witan and of Harold's acceptance of the English crown was carried across the channel to William, he was really or feignedly transported with rage. He declared that Edward, who was his cousin, had during his lifetime promised the throne to him, and that Harold had assented to this, and by solemn oath engaged to sustain him. He now demanded of Harold that he surrender to him the usurped throne, threatening the immediate invasion of the island in case he refused. King Harold answered the demand by expelling from the country the Normans who had followed Edward into the kingdom, and by collecting fleets and armies for the defense of his dominions.

Meanwhile Duke William was making every preparation to carry out his threat, and to consummate his long-cherished project of the conquest of England. He stirred up all the embers of the old Norman hatred of the English race; enlisted the sympathies of Europe in his behalf by a skillful presentation of his side of the dispute; and even succeeded in securing from the pope, Alexander II, his blessing upon the enterprise, and the gift of a consecrated banner. The pope assisted William in his undertaking, in hopes of being in turn aided by him to secure increased power over the English churches. At length everything was ready for a descent upon the English coast.

ENGLAND
AND
WALES
1066–1485.
Bannockburn
Dunfermline
Linlithgow
Dunbar
Edinburgh
Bothwell
The Tweed
Berwick
Homildon Hill
Bamborough
Dunstanborough
NORTHUMBERLAND
Newcastle
The Tyne
The Wear
The Tees
Dumfries
GALLOWAY
Hexham
Durham
DURHAM
CUMBERLAND
WESTMORELAND
Scarborough
YORKSHIRE
York
Tuxton
Wakefield
Rarenspur
The Humber
LINCOLNSHIRE
Lincoln
Boston
The Wash
ANGLESEA
CHESHIRE
Chester
Snowdon
Bloreheath
Nottingham
The Peak
Derby
Trent
Lynn
NORFOLK
Norwich
SHROPSHIRE
Shrewsbury
Bosworth
Leicester
RUTLAND
HUNTINGDON
CAMBRIDGE
Ely
Ludlow
Coventry
WARWICK
NORTHAMPTON
Warwick
Cambridge
SUFFOLK
Bury St. Edmunds
Cardigan
Mortimer's Cross
Northampton
BEDFORD
Bedford
Banbury
Ipswich
Tewkesbury
Colchester
St. Albans
HERTFORD
ESSEX
Barnet
Milford Haven
Tenby
Oxford
Bristol
Bath
WILTSHIRE
BERKSHIRE
LONDON
Thames
Rochester
Canterbury
Sandwich
Devizes
SURREY
KENT
Salisbury
Romney
Dover
Winchelsea
SUSSEX
Southampton
Chichester
Lewes
Hastings
DEVON
Exeter
DORSET
Dorchester
Portsmouth
ISLE OF WIGHT
Plymouth
Weymouth
PORTLAND
CORNWALL
STRUTHERS & CO. N.Y.

168. Battle of Stamford Bridge (1066). — While Harold was watching the southern coasts against the Normans, a terrible foe appeared in the north, led by Tostig, the traitor brother of the English king, and Harold Hardrada, king of Norway. The latter had been brought up at the Swedish court in Russia, had afterwards commanded the famous Varangian guard of the emperor of Constantinople (par. 116), had fought for the faith against the Saracens in the Mediterranean, and now was aspiring to build up in the north such an empire as that over which Canute had reigned. To effect the conquest of England he had collected an immense fleet from the ports of Scandinavia, from Flanders, Scotland, Iceland, and the Orkneys, and having descended upon the northern shore of England, was now sacking and burning the coast towns. The English army in that quarter, attempting to withstand the invaders, was cut to pieces; and the important city of York fell into the hands of the Northmen.

As soon as news of this disaster was borne to Harold in the south, he instantly marched northward with his army, and at Stamford Bridge met the invaders, and there gained a decisive victory over them. The Norwegian king ended his wild and adventurous life upon the fatal field.

169. The Battle of Hastings (1066). — The brilliant victory at Stamford Bridge delivered England from a most threatening danger. But Harold and his brave men were now called to face a still more formidable enemy. The festivities that followed the victory were not yet ended when a messenger from the south brought to Harold intelligence of the landing of the Normans. Hurrying southward with his army, Harold came face to face with the forces of William at Senlac, a short distance from the port of Hastings, which latter place gave name to the battle that almost immediately followed.

The night preceding the battle was spent by the English soldiers in feasting and carousing round their camp-fires, while the Normans passed it in prayer and devotion, in

preparation for the encounter of the morrow. The English were elated over their recent victory; yet at the same time that victory had thinned their ranks, and the forced marches that had followed had taxed their powers of endurance to the utmost.

With the morning the battle opened — the battle that was to determine the fate of England. It was begun by a horseman riding out from the Norman lines and advancing alone toward the English army, tossing up his sword and skillfully catching it as it fell, and singing all the while the stirring battle-song of Charles the Great and Roland. The English watched with astonishment this exhibition of "careless dexterity," and if they did not contrast the vivacity and nimbleness of the Norman foe with their own heavy and clumsy manners, others at least have not failed to do so for them.

The battle once joined, the conflict was long and terrific. The day finally went against the English. Harold fell, pierced through the eye by an arrow; and William was master of the field (1066).

170. The Completion of the Conquest (1067–1070). — William now marched upon London, and at Westminster, on Christmas Day, 1066, was crowned and anointed king of England; but he was yet far from being such in fact. The most formidable resistance made to the Conqueror was in the north, where the population was composed chiefly of Danes, who were aided by their kinsmen from Denmark. To protect himself on this side, William finally ravaged all the country between the Humber and the Tees, converting it into an uninhabitable desert. More than a quarter of a century afterwards, the desolated district was marked by untilled fields and the charred ruins of hamlets and towns. One hundred thousand people, deprived of food and shelter, perished miserably during the unusually severe winter following the cruel act. Thousands of others fled the country and entered the service of foreign princes. Many found their way to Constantinople, where they

enlisted in the Varangian Guard and helped fight the battles of the emperors of the East.

171. The Distribution of the Land and the Gemot of Salisbury. — Almost the first act of William after he had established his power in England was to fulfill his promise to the nobles who had aided him in his enterprise, by distributing among them the unredeemed [1] estates of the English who had fought at Hastings in defense of their king and country. Large as was the number of these confiscated estates, there would have been a lack of land to satisfy all, had not subsequent uprisings against the authority of William afforded him an opportunity to confiscate almost all the soil of England as forfeited by treason.[2]

Profiting by the lesson taught by the wretched condition of France, which country was kept in a state of constant turmoil by a host of feudal chiefs and lords, many of whom were almost or quite as powerful as the king himself (par. 154), William took care that in the distribution no feudatory should receive an entire shire, save in two or three exceptional cases. To the great lord to whom he must needs give a large fief, he granted not a continuous tract of land, but several estates or manors scattered in different parts of the country, in order that there might be no dangerous concentration of property or power in the hands of the vassal.

Another equally important limitation of the power of the vassal was effected by William through his requiring all fief-holders, great and small, to take an oath of fealty directly to him as overlord. This was a great innovation upon feudal

1 "When the lands of all those who had fought for Harold were confiscated, those who were willing to acknowledge William were allowed to redeem theirs, either paying money at once or giving hostages for the payment." — STUBBS, *Const. Hist.*, vol. i, p. 258.

2 "The actual amount of dispossession was, no doubt, greatest in the higher ranks; the smaller owners may, to a large extent, have remained in a mediatised position [*i.e.*, as sub-tenants] on their estates." — *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 260. As many as twenty thousand Saxon proprietors are said to have been dispossessed by as many Norman followers of William.

custom, for the rule was that the vassal should swear fealty to his own immediate lord only, and in war follow his banner even against his own king. The oath that William exacted from every fief-holder made the allegiance which he owed to his king superior to that which he owed to his own immediate lord. At the great gemot or military assembly of Salisbury in the year 1086 "all the landholders of substance in England" swore to William this solemn oath of superior fealty and allegiance.

William also denied to his feudatories the right of coining money and making laws; and by other wise restrictions upon their power, subordinating, for instance, all the baronial courts to the jurisdiction of the royal judges, he saved England from those endless contentions and petty wars that were distracting almost every other country of Europe.

In a word, he gave England a strong central government. This was one of the great blessings conferred upon the country by the Norman Conquest; for hitherto everything had been too local and fragmentary, some of the powerful Saxon barons, as, for instance, Godwin, earl of Wessex, frequently exercising as much power as the king himself.

To overawe the dispossessed people, William now built and garrisoned fortresses or towers in all the principal cities of the realm. The celebrated Tower of London, and the great black massive tower still standing in the city of Newcastle, were built by him, and are impressive memorials of the days of the Conquest. His nobles also erected strong castles upon their lands, so that the whole country fairly bristled with these fortified private residences. With the towns dominated by the great fortresses, and the open country watched over by the barons secure in their thick-walled castles, the Normans, though vastly inferior in numbers to the conquered Saxons, were able to hold them in perfect subjection.

172. **Domesday Book.** — One of the most celebrated acts *of the Conqueror* was the making of Domesday Book. This

famous book contained a description and valuation of all the lands of England, — excepting those of some counties, mostly in the north, that were either unconquered or unsettled; an enumeration of the cattle and sheep; and statements of the income of every man. It was intended, in a word, to be a perfect survey and census of the entire kingdom.

The commissioners who went through the land to collect the needed information for the work were often threatened by the people, who resented this "prying into their affairs," and looked upon the whole thing as simply another move preparatory to fresh taxation. But notwithstanding the bitter feelings with which the English viewed the preparation of the work, it was certainly a wise and necessary measure, and one prompted by statesmanlike motives.

173. The Curfew and the Forest Laws. — Among the regulations introduced into England by the Conqueror was the peculiar one known as the Curfew-bell. This law required that, upon the ringing of the church bell at nightfall, every person should be at home, and that the fires should be buried[8] and the lights extinguished.

Two reasons have been assigned for this ordinance: the one supposes that its object was to prevent the people's assembling by night to plan or execute treasonable undertakings; the other represents it simply as a safeguard against fire. The law was certainly in force in Normandy before the Conquest; indeed, according to Palgrave, it was a universal custom of police throughout the whole of mediæval Europe.

Less justifiable and infinitely more odious to the people were the Forest Laws of the Normans. The Normans were excessively fond of the chase. William had for the sport a perfect passion. An old chronicler declares that "he loved the tall deer as if he were their father." Extensive tracts of country were turned into forests by the destruction of the farmhouses and villages. More than fifty hamlets, and

[8] Hence the term "Curfew," from *couvrir*, to cover, and *feu*, fire.

numerous churches, are said to have been destroyed in the creation of what was known as the New Forest.[4]

The game in these forests was protected by severe laws. To kill a deer was a greater crime than to kill a man. Several members of the Conqueror's family were killed while hunting in these royal preserves, and the people declared that these misfortunes were the judgment of Heaven upon the cruelty of their founder.

174. Close of William's Reign. — All the last years of the Conqueror's life were filled with trouble and sorrow. "His bow was broken, and his sword was blunted." The most trying thing, perhaps, was the misconduct of his oldest son, Robert, who attempted to secure the government of Normandy, claiming that his father had promised it to him in case his enterprise against England proved successful. Robert was joined in his revolt by many discontented nobles, and aided by the French king, who had always viewed with great jealousy the growing power of the Norman duke. A reconciliation was at last effected between father and son.

In the year 1087 the Conqueror was engaged in his last quarrel. The French king Philip had aroused the fierce anger of William by an unseemly remark about his person. In revenge for the jest, William made war upon the king and burnt the town of Mantes. As he was riding over the smoking ruins of the place, his horse shied suddenly, and William received a hurt of which he died in a few days. Before his death he made known his will as to his three sons: Robert's unfilial conduct was forgotten, and he was given Normandy; William was given England; while Henry received 5000 pounds of silver.

175. The Norman Successors of the Conqueror (1087–1154). — For nearly three-quarters of a century after the death of William the Conqueror, England was ruled by Norman kings.

[4] The term "forest" as applied to these hunting-parks does not necessarily mean a continuous wooded tract, but simply untilled ground left to grow up to weeds and shrubs as a covert for game.

Three names span this long period, — William II, known as Rufus, or the Red (1087–1100); Henry I, surnamed Beauclerc, or the "good scholar" (1100–1135); and Stephen of Blois (1135–1154), a grandson of the Conqueror.

Notwithstanding the many oppressive laws and cruel acts that marked the reigns of the sons of the great duke, — William and Henry, — England flourished under their rule; commerce and the various industries were steadily progressing, and the Normans and the English, forgetting their mutual enmities, were gradually blending into a single people.

But upon the death of Henry a dispute as to the succession arose between his daughter Matilda and Stephen of Blois. For several years the realm was wasted by civil war. Eventually, through the mediation of the bishops of the Church, a covenant was made between the contending parties, whereby it was agreed that Stephen should hold the crown undisturbed during his life, but that at his death it should go to the son of Matilda. The year following this arrangement Stephen died, and the crown was placed, according to the treaty, upon the head of Henry of Anjou, who thus became the founder of the dynasty of the Angevins, or Plantagenets (1154).

176. Results of the Norman Conquest. — The most important and noteworthy result of the Conquest was the establishment in England of a strong centralized government. This came about not only through the monarchical views of government brought in by the Norman kings and the modification of feudal rules and practices effected by the Conqueror, but also through the wholesome lessons impressed upon the minds of the people by the intolerable anarchy of Stephen's reign. England now became a real kingdom, — what it had hardly been in more than semblance before.

A second result of the Conquest was the founding of a new feudal aristocracy. The Saxon thane was displaced by the Norman baron. This not only introduced a new and more refined element into the social life of England, but it also

changed the membership, the temper, and the name of the national assembly, the old English Witan now becoming the Parliament of later times.

A third result of the Conquest was the drawing of England into closer relations with the countries of continental Europe. The Norman Conquest was in this respect like the Roman conquest of the island. Through the many continental relations — political, social, commercial, and ecclesiastical — now established or made more intimate, England's advance in trade, in architecture, in her religious and intellectual life, was greatly promoted. And in this connection must be borne in mind particularly the close political and feudal relations into which England was brought with France, for out of these grew the jealousies and rivalries which led to the long Hundred Years' War between the two countries.[5]

Sources and Source Material. — ORDERICUS VITALIS, *Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy* (Bohn). Ordericus was a chronicler of the generation following the Norman Conquest. He was born in England, but passed his life as a monk in Normandy. The author states the object of his work to be to "unfold with truth contemporary events." As a matter of fact, however, he goes back to the "source of all things," — that is, to the birth of Christ. His voluminous work (in our translation it fills four thick volumes) is a vast storehouse of facts, — unfortunately, however, ill-arranged. The English edition can be consulted readily by means of the Index. *The Bayeux Tapestry.* (Reproduced in autotype plates with historic notes by Frank Rede Fowke, London, 1875.) This is a strip of linen canvas over two hundred feet long and nineteen inches wide, upon which are embroidered in colors seventy-two pictures, representing episodes in the Norman conquest of England. The work was executed not long after the events it depicts, and is named from the cathedral in France where it is kept. Its importance consists in the information it conveys respecting the life and manners, and the costumes, arms, and armor of the times. Lee's *Source-Book of English History*, pp. 111–129. Kendall's *Source-Book of English History*, chap. iii, "Norman England."

[5] *For the effects of the Conquest upon the English language and literature, see pars. 332 and 333.*

Secondary or Modern Works. — FREEMAN (E. A.), ***The Norman Conquest.* This is a little book of 156 pages, which contains "the same tale told afresh," that fills the six volumes of the author's earlier great work on the Norman Conquest. Freeman has made this subject especially his own. Also by the same author, *William the Conqueror* (Twelve English Statesmen). JOHNSON (A. H.), **The Normans in Europe* (Epoch Series). CREASY (E. S.), *Decisive Battles of the World*, chap. vii, "The Battle of Hastings, A.D. 1066." GREEN (J. R.), *The Conquest of England*, chap. x. GIBBON (E.), *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. lvi. JEWETT (S. O.), *The Story of the Normans* (Story of the Nations), chap. vii, "The Normans in Italy." THOMSON (R.), *An Historical Essay on Magna Charta* (London, 1829), pp. 339–368. A most interesting and instructive commentary on the forest charters of the Norman kings. TRAILL (H. D.), *Social England*, vol. i, chap. iii. PALGRAVE (F.), *History of Normandy and of England*, 4 vols. For the special student. MAITLAND (F. W.), *Domesday Book and Beyond.* The first third of this work is a scholarly investigation and interpretation of the contents of Domesday Book.

CHAPTER XII

THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE

177. The Two World-Powers. — "The two great ideas," says James Bryce, "which expiring antiquity bequeathed to the ages that followed were those of a world-monarchy and a world-religion." We have seen how out of one of these ideas, under the favoring circumstances of the earlier mediæval centuries, was developed the empire, and out of the other the papacy (chaps. vii and ix). The history of these two powers, of their relations to the rulers and the peoples of Europe, and of their struggle with each other for supremacy, makes up a large part of the history of the mediæval centuries. It is of these important matters that we must now try to get some sort of understanding.

What we have learned about the ideas and principles of feudalism will aid us greatly in our study, for, as we shall see, the whole long struggle between these two world-powers was deeply marked by feudal conceptions and practices.

178. The Three Theories respecting the Relations of Pope and Emperor. — After the revival of the empire in the West and the rise of the papacy, there gradually grew up three different theories in regard to the divinely constituted relation of the "World-King" and the "World-Priest." The first was that pope and emperor were each independently commissioned by God, the first to rule the spirits of men, the second to rule their bodies. Each reigning thus by original divine right, neither is set above the other, but both are to coöperate and to help each other. The special duty of the temporal power is to maintain order in the world and to be the protector of

the Church. The emperor bears the sword for the purpose of executing the decrees of the Church against all heretics and disturbers of its peace and unity. Thus this theory looked to a perfect and beautiful alliance between Church and State, a double sovereignty emblemized in the dual nature of Christ.

The second theory, the one held by the imperial party, was that the emperor was superior to the pope in secular affairs. Arguments from Scripture and from the transactions of history were not wanting to support this view of the relation of the two world-powers. Thus Christ's payment of tribute money was cited as proof that he regarded the temporal power as superior to the spiritual; and again, his submission to the jurisdiction of the Roman tribunal was held to be a recognition on his part of the supremacy of the civil authority. And then, did he not say, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's"? Further, the gifts of Pippin and Charles the Great to the Roman see made the popes, it was maintained, the vassals of the emperors.

The third theory, the one held by the papal party, maintained that the ordained relation of the two powers was the subordination of the temporal to the spiritual authority, even in civil affairs. This view was maintained by such texts of Scripture as these: "But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man";[1] "See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant."[2] It was held also that the two swords of which Christ said "It is enough," were both given to Saint Peter, signifying that he was girded with both civil and spiritual authority. The conception was further illustrated by such comparisons as the following, — for in mediæval times parable and metaphor often took the place of argument: As God has set in the heavens two lights, the sun and the moon, so has he

[1] I Cor. ii, 15. [2] Jer. i, 10.

established on earth two powers, the spiritual and the temporal; but as the moon is inferior to the sun and receives its light from it, so is the emperor inferior to the pope and receives all power from him.[3] Again, the two authorities were likened to the soul and the body; as the former rules over the latter, so is it ordered that the spiritual power shall rule over and subject the temporal. In opposition to the arguments of the imperialists founded upon the gifts of Pippin and Charles the Great, was quoted the Donation of Constantine, and instanced the fact that Charles actually received the imperial crown from the hands of the pope.

The first theory was the impracticable dream of lofty souls who forgot that men are human. Christendom was virtually divided into two hostile camps, the members of which were respectively supporters of the imperial and the papal theory. The most interesting and instructive chapters of mediæval history after the tenth century are those that record the struggles between pope and emperor, springing from their efforts to reduce to practice and fact these irreconcilable theories.[4]

179. The Restoration of the Papacy. — The great struggle between the emperors and the popes began in the eleventh century. The contest was preluded by the revival and strengthening of both the empire and the papacy. It will be recalled how the empire, after the very idea of it had almost faded from the minds of many, was restored by Otto the Great. A little more than a century later the papacy was also revived and strengthened. This needs a word of explanation.

Throughout the greater part of the tenth and almost all the first half of the eleventh century, the papacy had been sunk

[3] Dante, maintaining the rights of the emperor, ruined the force of this comparison by pointing out that while the moon often eclipses the sun, the sun never eclipses the moon.

[4] *For a most admirable presentation of this whole subject, consult Bryce's The Holy Roman Empire.*


CENTRAL EUROPE
1180.
Western Empire
Kdm. of France & Vassal States
House of Anjou
House of Austria
Brandenburg
Aragon
DOMINIONS OF THE KING OF ENGLAND
KINGDOM OF FRANCE
KINGDOM OF BURGUNDY
KINGDOM OF GERMANY
KINGDOM OF ITALY
DENMARK
POLAND
HUNGARY
BOHEMIA
MORAVIA
AUSTRIA
PRUSSIA
POMERANIA
BRANDENBURG
SAXONY
HOLSTEIN
FRISIA
WESTFALIA
THURINGIA
MEISSEN
LUSATIA
BRABANT
FLANDERS
LORRAINE
CHAMPAGNE
NORMANDY
BRITTANY
GUIENNE
GASCONY
AQUITAINE
AUVERGNE
POITOU
BURGUNDY
PROVENCE
SEPTIMANIA
NAVARRE
ARAGON
SWABIA
BAVARIA
FRANCONIA
CARINTHIA
CARNIOLA
CORSICA
London
Lincoln
Norwich
Winchester
Canterbury
Bruges
Boulogne
Ghent
Liège
Aachen
Köln
Paderborn
Brunswick
Magdeburg
Bremen
Hamburg
Lübeck
Frankfurt
Mainz
Trier
Regensburg
Prag
Wien
Caen
Rouen
Laon
Rheims
Falaise
Le Mans
Nantes
Angers
Bourges
Poitiers
Strassburg
Besançon
Zurich
Geneva
Lyons
Aosta
Milan
Crema
Venice
Verona
Lodi
Grenoble
Turin
Alessandria
Genoa
Lucca
Florence
Pisa
Ancona
Rome
Bordeaux
Bayonne
Vienne
Vaison
Avignon
Orange
Toulouse
Narbonne
Perpignan
Zaragoza
Barcelona
R. Elder
R. Elbe
R. Oder
R. Danube
R. Ebro
0
5
10
15
20
50
45
Longitude East from Greenwich

in the deepest moral degradation. This deplorable state of things had been created largely by the interference in the papal elections — which were nominally in the hands of the Roman clergy and people — by rival feudal factions at Rome which set up and pulled down popes at will. Through such influences it often happened that persons of scandalous life were, through violence and bribery, elevated to the papal chair.[5]

The papacy owed very largely its rescue from this deep degradation, and its liberation from this humiliating bondage, to the intervention of the imperial power. Among the emperors who did most to effect the moral regeneration of the Roman see was the Emperor Henry III (1039–1056). Exercising his authority as the guardian and protector of the Church, he nominated for the holy office a series of religious-minded and strong men, who were filled with that spirit of reform which just now was issuing from the cloisters of the celebrated monastery of Cluny.[6]

180. Pope Gregory VII (1073–1085) and his Conception of the Papacy. — The most eminent of the reform popes was Pope Gregory VII, better known by his earlier name of Hildebrand, the most noteworthy character, after Charles the Great,

[5] Out of efforts to improve this state of things, arose the Sacred College of Cardinals. This body was definitely created by a decree of the Lateran Synod of 1059, which acted under the inspiration of Pope Nicholas II. It was at first made up of the leading bishops, priests, and deacons connected with churches in and around Rome; later the members were chosen from a wider field. In 1585 the number of members of the college was fixed at seventy. Vacancies in the body are filled by the pope. The college now possesses the exclusive right of electing a pope, although at first the inferior Roman clergy enjoyed the privilege of confirmation. This electoral board constitutes one of the most important institutions of the Catholic Church. Its creation did not at once introduce decorum and regularity into the papal elections or free them from lay interference; partly for the reason that its rights were not universally recognized, and further because some of the popes made unworthy appointments to the body, which thereby became open to corrupt influences.

[6] The names of these reform popes, the predecessors of Gregory VII, are Clement II (1046–1048), Leo IX (1048–1054), Victor II (1054–1057), Stephen IX (1057–1058), Nicholas II (1058–1061), and Alexander II (1061–1073).

that the Middle Ages produced. In the year 1049 he was brought from the cloisters of Cluny to Rome, where he became the maker and adviser of popes, and finally was himself elevated to the pontifical throne, which he held from 1073 to 1085.

Gregory vehemently rejected the idea that the imperial power was superior to the papal, or even that the two were equal and coördinate. "The spiritual power was to stand related to the temporal as the sun to the moon, imparting light and strength, without, however, destroying it, or depriving princes of their sovereignty."[7] In a word, Gregory's idea was that all the Christian states should form a universal theocracy, with the pope at its head as God's representative on earth.

In order to realize his grand ideal, Gregory, as soon as he became pope, set about two important reforms, — the enforcement of celibacy among the secular clergy and the suppression of simony. Respecting each of these matters we must speak with some detail.

181. Gregory VII and the Celibacy of the Clergy. — When Gregory came to the papal throne one grave danger threatening the Church was the marriage of the clergy. From the very first there had prevailed in the Church two opposing views respecting the celibacy of the priesthood, some upholding the custom of clerical marriage, and others maintaining the superior sanctity of the unmarried state. In the eleventh century a great part of the minor clergy were married. One great injury to the Church which resulted from this was that it was introducing the feudal principle of heredity. The priests were coming to look upon their offices and the church lands under their care as fiefs, which they had a right to transmit to their children. With the offices of the Church thus rendered hereditary, it is easy to see how the authority of the pope over the clergy was being fatally impaired.

Gregory resolved to bring all the clergy to the strict observance of celibate vows. By thus separating the priests from

[7] *Alzog, Universal Church History*, vol. ii, p. 490.

the attachments of home, and lifting from them all family cares and responsibilities, he aimed to render their consecration to the duties of their offices more whole-souled and their dependence upon the Church more complete. A celibate priesthood would alone constitute a firm basis for the papal monarchy which Gregory aimed at establishing.

We will here simply stop to observe that the reform, though most obstinately opposed by a large section of the clergy, was finally effected — but not in Gregory's lifetime; so that celibacy became as binding upon the priest as upon the monk. It can hardly be doubted that in many ways the reform increased the efficiency of the Catholic priesthood, and certainly greatly enhanced the influence and authority of the popes.

182. Gregory VII and Simony. — Gregory's second reform, the correction of simony, had for one of its ultimate objects the freeing of the lands and offices of the Church from the control of lay lords and princes, and the bringing of them more completely into the hands of the Roman bishop.

The evil of simony[8] had grown up in the Church chiefly in the following way. As the feudal system took possession of European society, the Church, like individuals and cities, assumed feudal relations. Thus, as we have already seen, abbots and bishops, as the heads of monasteries and churches, for the sake of protection, became the vassals of powerful barons or princes. When once a prelate had promised fealty for his estates or temporalities, as they were called, these became thenceforth a permanent fief of the overlord, and subject to all the incidents of the feudal tenure (par. 148). When a vacancy occurred the lord assumed the right to fill it, just as in case of the escheat of a lay fief.[9] In this way the

[8] By simony is meant the purchase of an office in the Church, the name of the offense coming from Simon Magus, who offered Peter money for the power to confer the Holy Spirit. See Acts viii, 9–24.

[9] The clergy and monks still retained the nominal right of election, but too frequently an election by them was a mere matter of form. For a typical case see par. 232.

temporal rulers throughout Europe had come to exercise the right of nominating or confirming the election of almost all the great prelates of the Church.

Now these lay princes who had the patronage of these church offices and lands handled them just as they did their lay fiefs. They required the person nominated to an abbacy or to a bishopric to pay for the appointment and investiture a sum proportioned to the income from the office. This was in strict accord with the feudal rule which allowed the lord to demand from the vassal upon his investiture with a fief a sum of money called a relief. This rule, thus applied to church lands and offices, was, it is easy to see, the cause of great evil and corruption. The ecclesiastical vacancies were virtually sold to the highest bidder. And then, furthermore, the most unsuitable persons became bishops and abbots. The offices were given to favorites, to parasites, to mere children, to persons often of the most notoriously evil life.

Such was the deplorable state into which the Church had been brought by the application to ecclesiastical lands and offices of feudal principles. The maintenance of the unity of the Church and the preservation of religion itself demanded that the control of these ecclesiastical positions and estates should be taken away from the lay rulers.

To remedy the evil Gregory issued decrees [10] forbidding any one of the clergy to receive the investiture of a bishopric or abbey or church from the hands of a temporal prince or lord. Any one who should dare to disobey these decrees was threatened with the anathemas of the Church.

Such was the bold measure by which Gregory proposed to wrest out of the hands of the feudal lords and princes the vast patronage and immense revenues resulting from the relation they had gradually come to sustain to a large portion of the lands and offices of the Church. To realize the magnitude of the proposed revolution, we must bear in mind that the Church

[10] In 1078 and 1080.

at this time was in possession of probably one-fourth of the lands in the leading countries of the West. The complete success of the movement would make the pope the suzerain, or overlord, of all these vast ecclesiastical fiefs, and would fatally curtail and weaken the authority of every temporal ruler in Western Christendom.

183. Excommunications and Interdicts. — The principal instruments relied upon by Gregory for the carrying out of his plans were the spiritual weapons of the Church, — Excommunication and Interdict.

The first was directed against individuals. The person excommunicated was cut off from all relations with his fellowmen. If a king, his subjects were released from their oath of allegiance. Any one providing the excommunicate with food or shelter incurred the penalties of the Church. Living, the excommunicated person was to be shunned and abhorred as though tainted with an infectious disease; and dead, he was to be refused the ordinary rites of burial.

The interdict was directed against a city, province, or kingdom. Throughout the region under this ban, the churches were closed; no bell could be rung, no marriage celebrated, no burial ceremony performed. The sacraments of baptism and extreme unction alone could be administered.

It is difficult for us in these modern skeptical times to realize the effect of these anathemas during the "Age of Faith." They rarely failed in bringing the most contumacious offender to a speedy and abject confession, or in effecting his undoing. This will appear in the following paragraph.

184. The Investiture Contest; Emperor Henry IV's Humiliation at Canossa (1077). — It was in Germany that Gregory experienced the most formidable opposition to his reform measures. The emperor elect, King Henry IV (1056–1106), — who had been threatened by the pope with excommunication and deposition, — gathering in council such of the prelates of the empire as would answer his call (1076), even dared to

bid him descend from the papal throne. Gregory in turn gathered a council at Rome and deposed and excommunicated the emperor. "In the name of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," thus ran the solemn papal decree, "I withdraw through thy (Saint Peter's) power and authority, from Henry the king, son of Henry the emperor, who has arisen against thy Church with unheard-of insolence, the rule over the whole kingdom of the Germans and over Italy. And I absolve all Christians from the bond of the oath which they have made or shall make to him; and I forbid any one to serve him as king." [11]

This decree is especially memorable for the reason that this was the first time that a pope had ventured to depose a king.[12] The precedent was followed frequently enough in after times.

Henry's deposition encouraged a revolt on the part of some of his discontented subjects. He was shunned as a man accursed by heaven. His authority seemed to have slipped entirely out of his hands, and his kingdom was on the point of going to pieces. In this wretched state of his affairs there was but one thing for him to do, — to go to Gregory and humbly sue for pardon and reinstatement in the favor of the Church.

Henry sought Gregory among the Apennines, at Canossa, a stronghold of the celebrated Countess Matilda of Tuscany. But Gregory refused to admit him to his presence. It was winter, and on three successive days the king, clothed in sackcloth, stood with bare feet in the snow of the courtyard of the castle, waiting for permission to kneel at the feet of the pontiff and to receive forgiveness.

This was one of the most noteworthy transactions, in its moral significance, that the world had ever witnessed, — the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, the successor of the Cæsars and of Charles the Great, a rejected penitent at the door of the Roman pontiff.

[11] Henderson, *Select Historical Documents*, p. 377.
[12] Lea, *Studies in Church History*, p. 363.

On the fourth day the king was admitted to the presence of Gregory, and the sentence of excommunication was removed (1077). Henry had "stooped to conquer," for the victory was really his. He had forced absolution from an unwilling pope, and this release from the Church's censure meant much then to Henry and his cause.

Henry was now able to avenge his humiliation. He raised an army and descended upon Rome. The Normans, under Robert Guiscard (par. 166), came to the pope's defense. In the fighting and confusion which followed, Rome was reduced almost to ruins. Gregory was constrained to seek an asylum at Salerno, where he died in 1085. His last words were, "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile."

But the quarrel did not end here. It was taken up by the successors of Gregory, and Henry was again excommunicated. After maintaining a long struggle with the power of the Church, and with his own sons, who were incited to rebel against him, he finally died of a broken heart (1106). For five years his body was denied burial in consecrated ground; but at last the ban of the Church was removed, and it was laid to rest with fitting honors.

185. Concordat of Worms (1122). — Henry's humiliation, though it purchased him a personal victory, gave a severe blow to the prestige of the imperial power. Nevertheless his successors maintained the quarrel with the popes. The outcome of the matter, after many years of bitter contention, was the celebrated Concordat of Worms (1122). It was agreed that all bishops and abbots of the empire, after free canonical election, should receive the ring and staff, the symbols of their spiritual jurisdiction, from the pope, but that the emperor should exercise the right of investiture by the touch of a scepter, the emblem of temporal rights and authority. This was a recognition by both parties that all spiritual authority emanates from the Church and all temporal authority from the

State. It was a compromise, — "a rendering unto Cæsar of the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

But however equal the compromise may at first blush appear, it was after all a moral victory for the papacy. The concordat rescued the Church from the grave danger of complete secularization; for the triumph of the lay power in its contention would have made the Church "a machine to be worked . . . by the hands of the civil magistrates," [18] a part of the constitution of the feudal empire and monarchy, just as the temple in ancient Greece and Rome was a part of the constitution of the city-state.

We must here drop the story of the contentions of pope and emperor in order to watch the peoples of Europe as at the time we have now reached they undertake with surprising unanimity and enthusiasm the most remarkable enterprises in which they were ever engaged, — the Crusades, or Holy Wars.

It was the prestige and strength which the papacy had gained in its contest with the empire which enabled the popes to exert such an influence in setting the Crusades in motion and in directing them, while at the same time it was these great enterprises which, reacting upon the papacy, greatly aided the popes in realizing Gregory's ideal of making the papal authority supreme throughout Western Christendom.

Sources and Source Material. — DANTE, *De Monarchia* (trans. by F. J. Church). This forms an appendix (pp. 177–304) to Church's essay entitled "Dante" (Macmillan, 1878). Dante's argument is this: first, he shows the need of a supreme temporal ruler; second, he proves from history that the Roman empire "was willed of God"; and third, he argues that the authority of the monarch or emperor comes direct from God and not from the pope. The work is a most instructive illustration of mediæval ideals and mediæval reasoning. Henderson's *Select Historical Documents*, pp. 351–409, "Decrees concerning Papal Elections and Documents relating to the Controversy over *Investiture.*"

[18] Bowden, *Life of Gregory the Seventh*, vol. ii, p. 376.

Secondary or Modern Works. — BRYCE (J.), ** *The Holy Roman Empire.* This little work has become a classic. BOWDEN (J. W.), ** *Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh.* LEA (H. C.), *Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church* (2d. ed., Boston, 1884). A work of the highest scholarship. Chapter xiv is devoted to Gregory's reforms. ADAMS (G. B.), *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. x, "The Empire and the Papacy." ALZOG (J.), *Universal Church History*, vol. ii, pp. 253–336 and 481–510. STORRS (R. S.), *Bernard of Clairvaux*, lect. ii. Gives the point of view from which Gregory's work should be surveyed. TOUT (T. F.), *The Empire and the Papacy* (Periods of European History). STEPHENS (W. R. W.), *Hildebrand and His Times* (Epochs of Church History). MILMAN (H. H.), *History of Latin Christianity*, vol. ii, bk. vii, chaps. i–iii. ALLEN (J. H.), *Christian History in its Three Great Periods*, vol. ii, chap. i, "The Ecclesiastical System"; and chap. ii, "The Work of Hildebrand." VINCENT (M. R.), *The Age of Hildebrand* (Ten Epochs of Church History). Earlier chapters. FISHER (H.), *The Mediæval Empire*, vol. i, chap. xii.

CHAPTER XIII

THE CRUSADES (1096–1273)

I. Preparation of Europe for the Crusades

186. The Crusades defined; their Place in Universal History. —The Crusades were great military expeditions carried on intermittently for two centuries by the Christian peoples of Europe for the purpose of rescuing from the hands of the Mohammedans the holy places of Palestine and maintaining in the East a Latin kingdom. Historians usually enumerate eight of these expeditions as worthy of special narration. Of these eight the first four are often designated the Principal Crusades and the remaining four the Minor Crusades. But besides these there were a children's crusade and several other expeditions, which, being insignificant in numbers or results, are not usually enumerated, as well as several enterprises in Europe itself which partook of the nature of crusades; namely, the wars against the Moors in Spain, the crusades against the Albigenses in France, and those against the pagan Slavs of the Baltic shores.

Viewed from the broadest standpoint the crusades against the Moslems were simply an episode in that age-long drama of the struggle between the East and the West, between Asia and Europe, of which the contest between the ancient Greeks and Persians was the opening act. Looked at in connection with a narrower cycle of events, they mark the culmination of the long contest between the two great world-religions, Islam and Christianity, the beginnings of which we have already seen, and which expresses itself to-day in the antagonism

between the Ottoman Turks and the Christian races of Europe.

We shall tell first of the causes which gave birth to these remarkable enterprises; then narrate with some degree of particularity the most important events which characterized the First Crusade, passing more lightly over the incidents of the succeeding ones, as these in all essential features were simply repetitions of the first movement; and follow this with a very short account of the crusades within the limits of Europe. Then we shall close our brief survey by a glance at the causes which brought the movements to an end and with a summary of their results.

187. The Religious Motive, or Cause; Pilgrimages. — The forces behind such vast and long-sustained movements in history as the Crusades are always slowly generated in the minds and hearts of those taking part in them. The chief moving force of the Holy Wars was the religious ideas and feelings of the times, particularly the sentiment respecting holy places and pilgrimages. The history of this phase of the inner soul-life of the peoples of Western Christendom is long and interesting.

In all ages men have been led by curiosity, sentiment, or religion to make pilgrimages to spots which retain the memory of remarkable occurrences, or have been consecrated by human suffering or heroism. Especially has the religious sentiment of every people made the birthplaces or the tombs of their prophets, saints, and martyrs places of veneration and pilgrimage. Benares, Mecca, and Jerusalem attest the universality and strength of the sentiment among Hindus, Mohammedans, and Christians alike.

Among the early Christians it was thought a pious and meritorious act to undertake a journey to some sacred place. Prayers, it was believed, were more efficacious when offered on such consecrated ground. Especially was it thought that a pilgrimage to the land whose soil had been pressed by the feet

of the Saviour of the world, to the Holy City that had witnessed his martyrdom, was a peculiarly pious undertaking, and one which secured for the pilgrim the special favor and blessing of Heaven.

Pilgrims began to make visits to the Holy Land from the countries of Western Europe as soon as Christianity had taken possession of this part of the Roman empire. At first the journey was so difficult and dangerous that it was undertaken by comparatively few. Before the conversion of the Hungarians, who held the route between Germany and the Bosporus, the pilgrim usually made his way to some Mediterranean port, and sought a chance passage on board some vessel engaged in the Eastern trade.

It was a great event in a community when a person announced his intention of making the holy pilgrimage. He was conducted by a great company of his friends and neighbors out of his native town, and with the benediction of the priest, and the gift of a staff and wallet, was sent forward on his pious journey.

Arriving at the Holy City, the devotee prayed and wept upon every spot pointed out by tradition as the scene of the miracles or sufferings of the Saviour. Lastly, he bathed in the sacred waters of the Jordan, and from that spot brought back with him a palm branch, which was laid upon the altar of his native church as a token of the accomplishment of his pilgrimage. From this last circumstance one who had made a journey to the Holy Land, in distinction from a person who had made a pilgrimage to some other sacred place, was called a *palmer*.

The Cluniac revival of the eleventh century (par. 47), kindling as it did a holy fervor in multitudes of souls, gave a great impulse to this pilgrimaging zeal, and caused the number of pilgrims to the Holy Land greatly to increase. Instead of solitary travelers, companies numbering hundreds and even thousands[1] might now be seen crowding the roads leading to

[1] *The largest company of which there is record numbered 7000 persons. This was led by an archbishop and set out in the year 1064.*

Jerusalem; for the conversion of the Hungarians had recently reopened the overland route down the Danube.

But just at this time a great revolution took place in the political affairs of the East. From the time of Constantine on to the Arabian conquest, the holy places were in the hands of the Christians themselves. The Saracen caliphs, for the four centuries and more that they held possession of Palestine, pursued usually an enlightened policy towards the pilgrims, even encouraging pilgrimages as a source of revenue.

But now all was changed. The Seljuk Turks, a prominent Tartar tribe, zealous proselytes of Islam, had gradually extended their authority until they had built up a kingdom which stretched from the frontiers of China to the Hellespont. Jerusalem was taken by them in 1076, the greater part of Asia Minor, which had simply been overrun by the Arabs, was also conquered, and the city of Nicæa, only seventy miles from Constantinople, was made one of their strongholds. Almost all the Asiatic conquests of the Saracen caliphs were wrested from them, and the authority of the race that but a few centuries before had seemed on the point of becoming supreme throughout the world was once more virtually confined to the Arabian peninsula.

The Christians were not long in realizing that power had fallen into new hands. They were insulted and persecuted in every way. The aged patriarch of Jerusalem is said to have been subjected to every indignity, and the churches of the Christians in some cases to have been destroyed or desecrated. Pilgrims still continued to flock to the holy places, but the tales of their woes and sufferings attested with what danger the undertaking was now attended.

The Christians of Europe were wrought to indignation by these accounts of the insults heaped upon the holy places, and were moved to tears by the recitals of the personal sufferings of the pilgrims themselves. If it were a meritorious thing to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulcher, much more would

it be a pious act to rescue the sacred spot from the profanation of infidels. This was the conviction that changed the pilgrim into a warrior. This was the sentiment that for two centuries and more stirred Western Christendom to its profoundest depths, and cast the population of Europe in wave after wave upon Asia.

188. The Growth of a Martial Spirit in the Church; the Church and Chivalry. — This transformation of pilgrimages into crusades would not have been possible had not the Church itself in the course of the centuries undergone an amazing transformation. In the earliest Christian times a Quaker spirit ruled the Church; by the eleventh century a martial spirit had taken complete possession of it. Christ had commanded his disciples to put up the sword; now the head of the Church commanded all to gird on the sword and fight for the faith.

Various causes and circumstances had concurred to effect in the Church this astonishing transformation. First, Christianity, while transforming the barbarians, had been itself transformed by them. The new converts had carried their martial spirit into the Church. Fighters they had been and fighters they remained. Transformed by this alien spirit the Church modified its early Quaker teachings, and came at last to approve the military life, which the first Christians had very generally condemned as incompatible with the teachings of the Master.

A second cause of the transformation is to be sought in the mediæval way of thinking about ordeals, especially the ordeal of battle. As we have seen, the idea underlying the wager of battle was that God would miraculously intervene and give victory to the right. How natural then the belief that in the greater matter of a battle between armies God might be trusted to give righteous judgment. This conviction was reinforced by the chronicles of the Old Testament. In the wars waged by the Jews at the command of Jehovah against their

heathen enemies the mediæval Christians found ample warrant for their crusades against the pagan and infidel enemies of the Church.

Still a third influence that helped to introduce the military spirit into the Church was the reaction upon it of the martial creed of Islam. For three centuries and more before the First Crusade the Moslems had been in contact, and during much of this time in actual combat, with the Christians of Europe. Under such circumstances the Church, as was natural, caught the military spirit of Mohammedanism, and became quite as ready as its rival to call upon its followers to fight in defense or for the spread of the faith.

This military spirit in Christendom found characteristic expression in chivalry. We have already spoken of the relation of the Church to the institution of knighthood (par. 157). Chivalry passed under its tuition and patronage. When at the close of the eleventh century there went forth the papal call for volunteers for the Holy Wars, it fell upon the willing ears of myriads of knights eager to make good their oaths of knighthood and to win renown in combat with the Moslem infidel. Once the old pagan Rome had made use of these same war-loving men of the North to fight the battles of the empire; now the new Christian Rome enlists them beneath her standard to fight the battles of the Cross.

189. The Peace and the Truce of God. — Closely connected with the subject of the preceding paragraph, and also related in a very significant way to the Crusades, was the institution established by the Church in the eleventh century and known as the "Truce of God."

We have already become acquainted in some measure with the anarchical condition of society under feudalism. The central authority of the state was everywhere relaxed, and neither the emperor nor the kings were able to put a stop to the marauding and fighting of the great feudal lords. This

right of waging private war was one of the most dearly prized privileges of these semi-civilized barons. They were quite as unwilling to give up this right as the nations of to-day are to surrender their right of public war. So Europe had reverted to a state of primitive barbarism,— to that condition of perpetual warfare between tribes and clans that the continent was in before Rome arose, and after centuries of titanic effort established throughout her wide empire what was called the "Roman Peace" (*Pax Romana*). Every land was filled with fightings and violence. As one writer pictures it: "Every hill was a stronghold, every plain a battlefield. The trader was robbed on the highway, the peasant was killed at his plough, the priest was slain at the altar. Neighbor fought against neighbor, baron against baron, city against city."

In the midst of this intolerable anarchy the Church lifted up a protesting voice. In the early part of the eleventh century there was a movement in France which aimed at the complete abolition of war between Christians. The Church proposed to do what had been effected for a time by the Cæsars. It proclaimed what was called the "Peace of God." In the name of the God of peace it commanded all men to refrain from war and robbery and violence of every kind as contrary to the spirit and the teachings of Christianity. But it was found utterly impossible to make men desist from waging private wars, even though they were threatened with the everlasting tortures of hell.

Then the clergy in Southern France, seeing they could not suppress the evil entirely, concluded it were wiser to try to regulate it. This led to the promulgation of what was called the "Truce of God." We find the first trace of this in the year 1041.[2] The movement connects itself, as do almost all great moral reforms at this time, with the Cluniac revival.

In the year named the abbot of Cluny and several bishops united in issuing an edict in which all men were commanded

[2] Kluckhohn, *Geschichte des Gottesfriedens*, p. 38.

to maintain a holy and unbroken peace during four days of the week, from Thursday evening to Monday morning,[8] that is, during the days which were supposed to be rendered peculiarly sacred by the Saviour's death, burial, and resurrection. Whosoever should dare disobey the decree was threatened with the severest penalties of the Church.

This movement to redeem at least a part of the days from fighting and violence embraced in time all the countries of Western Europe. The details of the various edicts issued by Church councils and by the popes varied widely, but all embraced the principle of the edict of 1041.

This truce of God was not, as we may easily believe, very well observed; yet it did at least something during the eleventh and twelfth centuries to better the general condition of things, to mitigate the evils of private warfare, and to render life more tolerable and property more secure. We shall see a little later how the Church used the restraining authority it had acquired in this field to make it possible and safe for the feudal barons and knights, leaving their fiefs and other possessions under the protecting ægis of the Church, to go with their retainers on the distant expeditions of the Crusades.

190. Norman Restlessness and Crusading Zeal. — To the various causes and antecedents of the Crusades already noticed must be added as a near inciting cause that spirit of adventure and unrest with which almost all the lands of Western Europe were at just this time being filled by the enterprises of the Normans. The conquest of England by William the Conqueror and that of Southern Italy and Sicily by other Norman leaders were simply two of the most important of their undertakings. Throughout the eleventh century the Norman knights, true to the old Viking spirit of their ancestors, were constantly raiding in Spain, in Africa, and in other Moslem lands.

[8] Some edicts make the respite run from Wednesday evening to Monday morning.

Everywhere they engaged in battle with the infidels. Everywhere they stirred up the embers of the old fierce hate between Christian and Moslem. Everywhere throughout Western Christendom they awakened, by their own restless zeal, the crusading spirit, and thus did much to prepare the way for the Holy Wars.

191. Various Minor Causes. — We have now detailed the chief causes, remote and immediate, of the Crusades. But there were other concurring causes which must not be overlooked. Many took part in the expeditions from mere love of change, excitement, and adventure. Some of the Italian cities engaged in the undertakings from commercial or political motives. Many knights, princes, and even kings headed expeditions with a view of securing fiefs in the East from lands wrested from the infidel. Multitudes of serfs joined them in order to escape from a life of misery and oppression that had become unbearable. And vast numbers of the baser sort joined them in order to secure immunity from the penalty of debt and crime; for, as we shall see, the person and property of the Crusader were taken under the special protection of the Church.

Yet notwithstanding that so many unworthy motives animated vast numbers of those engaging in the Crusades, we shall not be wrong in thinking that it was the religious feeling of the times, the conviction that the enterprise of rescuing the sacred places was a holy one, which was the main motive power, in the absence of which all the other causes and motives enumerated would have proved wholly inadequate either to set in motion or to keep in motion these remarkable and long-continued expeditions. This is evidenced by the fact that it was chiefly the lands that had been affected by the Cluniac reform that responded first to the call of the preachers of the Crusades. Because it was a generous religious sentiment that organized them, because it was the moving force of a grand religious ideal that maintained them so long, they are *rightly called* Holy Wars.

192. Circumstances favoring the Crusading Enterprises. — Notwithstanding the number and strength of the forces that concurred to transform the population of the West into zealous crusaders, the Holy Wars would not have been possible, or would have failed to meet with even the partial and temporary success that actually attended them, had it not been for several timely and favoring circumstances.

First, just at this time (during the first half of the eleventh century) the Hungarians were converted, and thus the overland route to the East, which for centuries had been barred by these heathen hordes, was reopened. Thus was the pathway for the earlier Crusades prepared.

Second, the growth during the tenth and eleventh centuries of the sea-power of the republics of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa, together with that of the Normans, and the conquest by the latter of Sicily from the Saracens (par. 166), enabled the Christians to clear the Middle Mediterranean of the Moslem pirate ships that had vexed its waters and shores ever since the rise of the Mohammedan power. Because of the crusaders' dread of the sea, the water route to Palestine was not followed by the earlier expeditions; but the advantages of the water passage gradually came to be realized and all the later expeditions reached their destination by ship. From the beginning of the movements it was alone the command of the sea by the Italian cities that rendered possible that transport service which was indispensable to the maintenance of the colonies which as a result of the First Crusade were established in Palestine.

Third, just three or four years before the First Crusade the vast empire established in Asia by the Seljuk Turks (par. 187) fell to pieces and was replaced by a number of mutually jealous Turkish principalities. This was a most fortunate circumstance for the first crusaders, for had they been compelled to encounter the undivided forces of the original empire it is

not probable that any of them would ever have reached the Holy Land.

Fourth, the cause of the Christians was greatly furthered by the antagonism of the Arabs and the Turks. This antagonism — which has been prolonged to our own day — almost fatally divided the strength of the Mohammedan world.

Finally, the development within the Church of the papal power was a circumstance in the absence of which the Crusades could never have found a place in the history of Western Christendom. The popes used their preëminent authority to persuade the people to engage in the wars as pious undertakings. It was they who incited, organized, and directed with greater or less success the expeditions, and to them belongs whatever measure of praise or of censure attaches to the enterprises as a whole.

193. The Legend of Peter the Hermit. — There is a tradition which makes one immediate inciting cause of the First Crusade to have been the preaching of a monk named Peter the Hermit, a native of France. This legend tells how this monk, moved by devout longing, made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land; how his sympathy and indignation were stirred by the sight of the indignities and cruelties to which the native and the pilgrim Christians were subjected by the infidels; and how, armed with letters from the patriarch of Jerusalem to the Christians of Europe, he hastened to Rome, and there, at the feet of Pope Urban II, begged to be commissioned to preach a crusade for the deliverance of the Holy City. The pope is represented as commending warmly the zeal of the hermit, and, with promises of aid, sending him forth to stir up the people to engage in the holy undertaking.

The legend now exhibits the monk as going everywhere, and addressing in the streets and in the open fields the crowds that press about him. The people look upon the monk, clothed in the coarse raiment of an anchorite, as a messenger from *heaven, and even* venerate the ass upon which he rides. His

wild and fervid eloquence alternately melts his auditors to tears, or lifts them into transports of enthusiasm.

Such, in essential features, is the tradition of Peter the Hermit, which has come down to us in the history of William of Tyre, a chronicler who wrote towards the close of the twelfth century. The first part of this account is now discredited, and it seems quite certain that the monk's alleged pilgrimage to Jerusalem is a pure embellishment of the tale by later romancers. That the preaching of the monk, however, was of a most extraordinary character and produced a deep impression upon the popular mind is beyond doubt. But the real originator of the First Crusade was Pope Urban, and not the hermit, as the legend represents. It would appear also that the preaching of the monk took place after instead of before the great Council of Clermont, spoken of in the next paragraph, and was probably confined to Northeastern France.

194. The Councils of Piacenza and Clermont (1095). — While the religious feelings of the Christians of the West were growing tenser day by day, the Turks in the East were making constant advances, until at last they were threatening Constantinople itself. The emperor Alexius Comnenus sent urgent letters to the pope, asking for aid against the infidels, representing that, unless help were extended immediately, the capital with all its holy relics must soon fall into the hands of the barbarians.

Urban called a great council of the Church at Piacenza in Italy to consider the appeal (1095). It was a vast and enthusiastic assembly, for the religious feelings of Christendom had already been deeply moved. But threatening as were the dangers that impended above the sister church in the East, still so many other and discordant interests were represented by the different commissioners to the council that it was impossible to concert any measures looking towards the deliverance of the Eastern Church or the recovery of Jerusalem.

Later in the same year a new council was convened at Clermont in France, Urban purposely fixing the place of meeting among the warm-tempered and martial Franks. Fourteen archbishops, two hundred and twenty-five bishops, four hundred abbots, and of others a multitude that no man could number, crowded to the council. The town of Clermont could not hold the immense multitudes, which overflowed all the surrounding fields.

After the council had considered some minor matters the question which was agitating all hearts was brought before it. The pope himself was one of the chief speakers. He possessed the gift of eloquence, so that the man, the cause, and the occasion all contributed to the achievement of one of the greatest triumphs of human oratory. Urban pictured the humiliation and misery of the provinces of Asia; the profanation of the places made sacred by the presence and footsteps of the Son of God; and then he detailed the conquests of the Turks, until now, with almost all Asia Minor in their possession, they were threatening Europe from the shores of the Hellespont. "When Jesus Christ summons you to his defense," exclaimed the eloquent pontiff, "let no base affection detain you in your homes; whoever will abandon his house, or his father, or his mother, or his wife, or his children, or his inheritance, for the sake of his name, shall be recompensed a hundredfold, and possess life eternal."

Here the enthusiasm of the vast assembly burst through every restraint. With one voice they cried, "*Dieu le volt! Dieu le volt!*" "It is the will of God! It is the will of God!" Thousands immediately affixed the cross[4] to their garments as a pledge of their sacred engagement to go forth to the rescue of the Holy Sepulcher. The summer of the following year was set for the departure of the expedition.

[4] Hence the name "Crusades" given to the Holy Wars, from Old French *crois*, "*cross.*"

II. The First Crusade (1096–1099).

195. Mustering of the Crusaders. — It was the countries of France and Southern Italy that were most deeply stirred by the papal call. In these lands the contagion of the enthusiasm seized upon almost all classes alike; for it was the common religious feeling of the age to which the appeal had been especially made. The Council of Clermont had proclaimed anew the Truce of God, with a very great extension of its prohibitions, and had pronounced anathemas against any one who should invade the possessions of a prince engaged in the holy war. By edict the pope had granted to all who should enlist from right motives "remission of all canonical penalties," and promised to the truly penitent, in case they should die on the expedition, "the joy of life eternal."

Under such inducements princes and nobles, bishops and priests, monks and anchorites, saints and sinners, rich and poor, hastened to enroll themselves beneath the standard of the Cross. "Europe," says Michaud, "appeared to be a land of exile, which every one was eager to quit."

196. The Vanguard. — Before the regular armies of the crusaders were ready to move, those who had gathered about Peter the Hermit, becoming impatient of delay, urged him to place himself at their head and lead them at once to the Holy Land. Dividing command of the mixed multitudes with a poor knight called Walter the Penniless, and followed by a throng, it is said, of eighty thousand persons,[5] among whom were many women and children, the Hermit set out for Constantinople by the overland route through Germany and Hungary. Thousands of the crusaders perished miserably of hunger and exposure on the march. Those who crossed the Bosporus were surprised by the Turks, and almost all were

[5] As Kugler observes, the enormous figures of the chroniclers can only be taken to mean "a great many people." They represent, of course, simply vague guesses or estimates.

slaughtered. Thus perished the forlorn hope of the First Crusade.

197. March of the Main Body. — Meanwhile a real army was gathering in the West. Raymond, count of Toulouse; Hugh of Vermandois, a brother of the king of France; Robert, duke of Normandy; Godfrey of Bouillon, duke of Lower Lorraine; his brothers, Baldwin and Eustace; Bohemund, prince of Otranto, and his nephew, Tancred, the "mirror of knighthood," were among the most noted of the leaders of the different divisions of the army. The expedition is said to have numbered about three hundred thousand men.

As the country through which they were to pass could not afford provisions or forage for the whole body of crusaders, it was arranged that they should march in divisions by different routes, and reassemble at Constantinople. Godfrey of Bouillon, at the head of one division, marched directly through Germany and Hungary. Raymond of Toulouse led another band by a more southerly route through Dalmatia. Other companies climbed the Alps, crossed the Adriatic, and then resumed their journey by land.

Upon the arrival of the crusaders at Constantinople, the emperor tried to persuade their leaders to swear fealty to him as their overlord. This they at first refused to do; but finally, by means of flattery and bribes, he induced all the princes to pay him homage. But the homage thus paid was rather in form than in spirit, for the hardy warriors of the West held the effeminate Greeks in ill-concealed contempt.

198. Capture of Nicæa (1097); **March across Asia Minor; Capture of Antioch** (1098). — Once across the Bosporus, the crusaders straightway laid siege to the Turkish capital Nicæa, and in a short time forced its capitulation. The place, however, did not come into the possession of any Frankish prince, but was restored to the Eastern empire.

After the reduction of Nicæa the Christian army, marching *in two divisions* in order the better to secure food and forage,


15°
20°
25°
45°
40°
35°
30°
ADRIATIC SEA
HUNGARY
SERBIA
BYZANTINE EMPIRE
ITALY
APULIA
Bari
Brindisi
Otranto
Raymond of Toulouse 1096
Robert of Flanders
Bohemund 1096
Frederick I. 1189
Danube River
Philippopolis
Thessalonica
Philip Augustus
Philip Augustus 1191
GREECE
Athens
PELOPONNESUS
SICILY
Philip Augustus and Richard 1191
MEDITERRANEA
CRETE
AFRIC
THE CRUSADES
AND THE
BYZANTINE EMPIRE.
ABOUT 1150, A.D.
First Crusade, 1096-99 Raymond of Toulouse
Godfrey of Bouillon
Second " 1147-49 Louis VII, Conrad III.
Third " 1189-90 Frederick I.
" " 1190-91 Richard and Philip Augustus
Scale of Miles.
0 50 100 200 300

30°
35°
40°
45°
BLACK SEA
GEORGIA
Constantinople
Bosporus
PAPHLAGONIA
DOCHALDAEA
Crusade 1st 1101
Nicaea
DANISHMAND EMIRS
KINGDOM OF ICONIUM (SELJUKS)
Dorylaeum
Godfrey Bouillon
Caesarea
ARMENIA
Philadelphia
Iconium
1096
Marasch
Edessa
Tarsus
Louis VII 1148
Saleph
Haleb
Euphrates R.
Antioch
CYPRUS
Tortosa
Tripolis
Richard
Conrad III. 1148
Philip Augustus
Damascus
Tyre
Acre
Caesarea
Joppa
Ascalon
Gaza
Jerusalem
KINGDOM OF JERUSALEM
DOMINION OF THE SELJUKS OF IRAN
Damietta
EGYPT
THE M-N.ENG.

set out for Syria. At a place called Dorylæum, in Phrygia, the Turks fell upon and almost overwhelmed one of the columns before the other could render assistance. But the prowess of the Christian knights at last achieved a complete victory over the Turkish hordes.

After this defeat the Moslems did not risk another encounter, but resorted to desolating the country in front of the Latin army. So thoroughly was the work done, that the crusaders marched for five hundred miles through a land deserted alike by friend and foe, and which yielded scarcely anything for themselves or their animals. Almost all their horses died, and their own ranks were terribly thinned.

Arriving at Antioch, at this time one of the most populous cities of the East, the crusaders at once invested the place. After a siege of seven months, the city fell into their hands through treachery (1098).

199. The Holy Lance and the Ordeal of Bartholomew. — Scarcely were the Christians in possession of the city, before they were themselves besieged by an immense Moslem army. They were soon reduced to the last extremity of starvation and despair. Ready to die, they cursed God for deserting them, when they had given up all for his holy cause.

A supposed miracle was all that delivered the city from the power of the Mussulman host. A priest, Bartholomew by name, gave out that it had been revealed to him that, buried beneath the altar of one of the churches, would be found the lance which pierced the side of the Saviour, and which would give the Christians certain victory over their enemies. Upon search, the spear-head — "which had lain hidden since the days of the apostles" — was found, and instantly at sight of the holy relic an uncontrollable enthusiasm took possession of the crusaders. With the holy lance at their head as their standard, they rushed from the gates of the city, and falling upon the enemy with a fury nothing could withstand, scattered the host with terrific slaughter.

Bartholomew was afterwards accused of falsehood in this matter. He proposed to submit to the ordeal by fire (par. 58). Accordingly two great fires of dry olive branches were kindled upon the plain, so close together that the flames mingled. When all was ready, the priests advanced, bearing the holy relic. A brother priest then read the usual appeal: "If this man has seen Jesus Christ face to face, and if the apostle Andrew did reveal the divine lance to him, may he pass safe and sound through the flames; but if, on the contrary, he is guilty of falsehood, may he be burned up, together with the lance which he bears in his hand."

Then Bartholomew, after solemnly declaring that all he had told was true, rushed between the flames. He passed through, but was so badly burned that he lived only a little while after the ordeal. Some, however, ascribed the monk's death, not to the fire, but to hurts he received from the press of the crowd, and so the ordeal really settled nothing.

We have taken space to narrate this incident because better than anything else it illustrates what sort of men these were who were engaged in the rescue of the Holy Sepulcher.

200. The Capture of Jerusalem (1099). — Instead of marching directly upon Jerusalem after their victory, the crusaders wasted nearly a year in Northern Syria, some of their leaders being engaged in conquering fiefs for themselves in the region round about. Meanwhile the Fatimite caliph of Egypt, taking advantage of the panic which the successes of the Christians had produced among the Turks, had wrested Jerusalem from them. When the Latin warriors recommenced their march upon the Holy City, he sent an embassy to them, proposing that they join their forces in a war against the Turks. The crusaders replied that their oaths bound them to deliver the Holy Sepulcher from the hands of all infidels, Saracens as *well as* Turks, and to establish in the birthplace of their religion *a Christian* sovereignty.

So the army of deliverers pressed on towards Jerusalem. As they neared the object of all their toils and sufferings, the discord that had arisen in their ranks was hushed, and the enthusiasm that had animated them in the first days of their enterprise again inflamed every heart. Scarcely would they take needed repose, but frequently continued their march through the night. Finally, in the first light of a June morning, 1099, as their columns gained the brow of a hill, the walls and towers of the Holy City burst upon their view. A perfect delirium of joy seized the crusaders. The cry "Jerusalem! Jerusalem!" ran through their ranks. They embraced one another with tears of joy, and even embraced and kissed the ground on which they stood. As they pressed on, they took off their shoes, and marched with uncovered head and bare feet, singing the words of the prophet: "Jerusalem, lift up thine eyes, and behold the liberator who comes to break thy chains."

The Saracens had taken every precaution to secure the city against attack. A strong garrison had been thrown within its walls. Its defenses had been strengthened, and all the surrounding country laid waste, that there might be nothing for the subsistence of a besieging army. But the Christians at once advanced and laid siege to the place. Timber needed for the construction of assaulting engines was brought from a distance of twenty or thirty miles. A Genoese fleet which at this moment landed at Jaffa furnished additional material and instruments, besides skilled workmen.

The first assault made by the Christians was repulsed. But the appearance of a mysterious horseman on the Mount of Olives led the crusaders to believe that Saint George had come to lead them to victory; and with a reckless enthusiasm that struck dismay into the hearts of the Moslems, the Christians again threw themselves against the walls of the city. Nothing could withstand their terrific onset. The ramparts were swept of their defenders, and the city was in the hands of the crusaders (1099).

A terrible slaughter of the infidels followed. "And if you desire to know what was done with the enemy who were found there," thus runs a home letter of one of the crusaders, "know that in Solomon's Porch and in his temple our men rode in the blood of the Saracens up to the knees of their horses."

The Christians now took possession of the houses and property of the infidels, each soldier having a right to that which he had first seized and placed his mark upon. The poorest crusader suddenly found himself a householder and surrounded with luxury.

201. Founding of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. — No sooner was Jerusalem in the hands of the crusaders than they set themselves to the task of organizing a government for the city and country they had conquered. The government which they established was a model feudal state, called the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. The code known as the "Assizes of Jerusalem," which was a late compilation of the rules and customs presumably followed by the judges of the little state, forms one of the most interesting collections of feudal customs in existence.

At the head of the kingdom was placed Godfrey of Bouillon, the most devoted of the crusader knights. The prince refused the title and vestments of royalty, declaring that he would never wear a crown of gold in the city where his Lord and Master had worn a crown of thorns. The only title he would accept was that of "Baron of the Holy Sepulcher."

This Latin kingdom, established by such labors and sacrifices, embraced about a score of cities scattered throughout a region whose limits very nearly coincided with the boundaries of ancient Palestine. For several generations a constant stream of immigrants from the West poured into the country, so that it took on the aspect of a European land. Thus for a time Palestine became socially and politically an extension of Europe.

The fortunes of this little European colony will appear as *we proceed with* the recital of the Holy Wars.

202. The Battle of Ascalon (1099); **Close of the First Crusade.** — Scarcely had the crusaders organized the government of this little principality before they were informed of the advance of an immense army, collected from almost every part of the Mohammedan world, to avenge the slaughter of their brethren in the taking of Jerusalem. Without awaiting their near approach, the Christians, who now could muster not more than twenty thousand effective soldiers, marched out of the city and met the Moslem host on the plains of Ascalon. Here again was performed the miracle of faith and enthusiasm. By the furious charge of that little handful of Christian knights the Mohammedan hosts were scattered like chaff before the wind.

This victory of Ascalon, which was perhaps the most wonderful achievement of the Latin warriors, marks the last great battle of the First Crusade. Many of the crusaders, considering their vows to deliver the Holy City as now fulfilled, set out on their return to their homes, some making their way back by sea and some by land.

The arrival of the returning crusaders in their native countries, and their stories of the lands they had seen, of the exploits they had performed, of rich fiefs won in a day by knightly valor, again stirred all the West with the same delirium of enthusiasm that had thrilled it at the call of Pope Urban. And now were repeated the scenes that marked the beginning of the crusade. Great multitudes flocked to the standard of the Cross, and, without proper organization or leadership, pushed across Europe to Constantinople. From that capital they set out in three bands on their march across Asia Minor. Each of these was in turn almost annihilated by the Turks; only a few survivors ever found their way back to Europe. This ill-starred expedition marks the end of the First Crusade. It is estimated that during its progress the West lost more than one million of its warriors.

III. The Second Crusade (1147–1149)

203. Condition of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. — After the return of the main body of the crusaders, the position of Godfrey and his companion knights was a very critical one. Upon every side the little Christian state was pressed by watchful and vindictive Moslem foes. Under Godfrey and his successors, Baldwin I (1100–1118) and Baldwin II (1118–1130), the crusader knights were constantly busied in defending the cities of their domains against the attacks of the Saracens and the Turks, or in reducing the places still held by the enemy. Tiberias, Cæsarea, Ptolemais, Ascalon, Berytus, Sidon, Tyre, and many other places were wrenched from the Mohammedans, and the limits of the Christian kingdom thus extended in every direction.

204. Origin of the Military and Religious Orders. — It was about this time that the two great religious military orders known as the Hospitalers and the Templars were formed.

The Hospitalers, or Knights of Saint John, took their name from the fact that the organization was first formed (about 1130) among the monks of the Hospital of Saint John, at Jerusalem; while the Templars, or Knights of the Temple, were so called on account of one of the buildings of the brotherhood standing near or upon the site of Solomon's Temple. The objects of both orders were the care of the sick and wounded crusaders, the entertainment of Christian pilgrims, the guarding of the holy places, and ceaseless battling for the Cross. In the case of the Hospitalers it was monks who added to their ordinary monastic vows those of knighthood; in the case of the Templars it was knights who added to their military vows those of religion. Thus were united the seemingly incongruous ideals of the monk and the knight.

These fraternities soon acquired a military fame that was spread throughout the Christian world. They were joined by many of the most illustrious knights of the West, and through

the gifts of the pious acquired great wealth, and became possessed of numerous foundations in Europe as well as in Asia.

At a somewhat later period the order of the Teutonic Knights had its origin in a charitable association of philanthropic Germans, the immediate object of which was the relief of the sick and wounded German warriors in the trenches before Acre, which place the Christians were then besieging. The members of the society were soon raised by the German emperor, Frederick Barbarossa, to the order of knighthood, and then the knights began their remarkable career as the champions of Christianity, first against the infidels of Asia, and afterwards against the pagans of the Baltic shores (par. 220).

205. The Fall of Edessa (1144). — After the death of Godfrey and the first two Baldwins, the little Latin kingdom of Jerusalem was weakened by dissensions among the knights and barons, and its assailants became more successful in their attacks upon it. Finally, in the year 1144, the city of Edessa was taken by the Turks, and the entire population slaughtered, or sold into slavery. This city had always been looked upon as the bulwark of the Latin kingdom on the side towards Mesopotamia. Its fall not only carried terror and dismay through all the cities of Palestine, but threw the entire West into a state of the greatest apprehension and alarm, lest the little Christian state should be completely overwhelmed, and all the holy places should again fall into the hands of the infidels.

206. Preaching of Saint Bernard; Failure of the Crusade. — The scenes that marked the opening of the First Crusade were now repeated in many of the countries of the West. Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, an eloquent monk, was the second Peter the Hermit, who went everywhere, arousing the warriors of the Cross to the defense of the birthplace of their religion. The contagion of the enthusiasm seized upon not merely barons, knights, and the common people, which classes alone participated in the First Crusade, but the greatest sovereigns

were now infected by it. Louis VII, king of France, was led to undertake the crusade through remorse for an act of great cruelty of which he had been guilty against some of his revolted subjects.[6] Conrad III, emperor of Germany, was persuaded to leave the affairs of his distracted empire in the hands of God, and consecrate himself to the defense of the sepulcher of Christ.

The best part of the strength of both the German and the French division of the expedition was wasted in Asia Minor. Mere remnants of the armies joined in Palestine. The siege of Damascus, which was now undertaken, proved unsuccessful, and the crusaders returned home, "having accomplished all that God willed and the people of the country permitted."

IV. The Third Crusade (1189–1192)

207. Capture of Jerusalem by Saladin. — The Third Crusade was caused by the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin, the renowned sultan of Egypt. This event occurred in the year 1187. The intelligence of the disaster caused the greatest consternation and grief throughout Christendom.

Three of the great sovereigns of Europe, Frederick Barbarossa of Germany, Philip Augustus of France, and Richard I of England, assumed the Cross, and set out, each at the head of a large army, for the recovery of the Holy City.

The English king, Richard, afterwards given the title of *Cœur de Lion*, the "Lion-hearted," in memory of his heroic exploits in Palestine, was the central figure among the Christian knights of this crusade. He raised money for the enterprise by the persecution and robbery of the Jews; by the imposition of an unusual tax upon all classes; and by the sale of offices, dignities, and royal lands. When some one expostulated with him on the means employed to raise

[6] The act which troubled the king's conscience was the burning of thirteen hundred people in a church, whither they had fled for refuge.

money, he declared that he "would sell the city of London, if he could find a purchaser."

208. Death of Frederick Barbarossa; the Siege of Acre. — The German army, attempting the overland route, after meeting with the usual troubles in Eastern Europe from the unfriendliness of the natives, was decimated in Asia Minor by the hardships of the march and the swords of the Turks. The Emperor Frederick was drowned while crossing a swollen stream, and most of the survivors of his army, disheartened by the loss of their leader, soon returned to Germany.

The English and French kings — the first sovereigns of these two countries who had ever joined their arms in a common cause — took the sea route, and finally mustered their forces beneath the walls of Acre, which city the Christians were then besieging. After one of the longest and most costly sieges they ever carried on in Asia, the crusaders at last forced the place to capitulate, in spite of all the efforts of Saladin to render the garrison relief.

209. Richard and Philip. — The arrogant and perfidious conduct of Richard led to an open quarrel between him and Philip. The latter determined to retire from the war rather than continue the enterprise in connection with so haughty and ungenerous a rival. Accordingly he returned to France. Such is the account of the matter as given by the French writers, while the English chroniclers declare that Philip's action was prompted solely by his jealousy of the superior military ability of the English king; "for on Richard's arrival," writes a chronicler of the crusade, "Philip became obscured, just as the moon is wont to relinquish her luster at the rising of the sun." The root of the discord was doubtless English and French national jealousies.

210. Richard and Saladin. — The knightly adventures and chivalrous exploits which mark the career of Richard in the Holy Land, after the retirement of Philip from the field, read like a romance. Nor was the chief of the Mohammedans, the

renowned Saladin, lacking in any of those knightly virtues with which the writers of the time invested the character of the English hero. About these two names gather very many of those tales of chivalric valor and honor with which the chroniclers of the Crusades so liberally embellished this period of history.

Thus it is told that these two champions of the opposing faiths each held in such estimation the prowess and character of the other, that they frequently exchanged the most generous courtesies and knightly compliments. One was often a guest in the tent of the other. At one time when Richard was sick with a fever, Saladin, knowing that he was poorly supplied with delicacies, sent him a gift of the choicest fruits of the land; and on another occasion, Richard's horse having been killed in battle, the sultan caused a fine Arabian steed to be led to the Christian camp as a present for his rival.

211. Richard's Captivity. — For two years did Richard the Lion-hearted contend in almost daily combat with his generous antagonist for the possession of the tomb of Christ. But the Christian hero was destined never to bow his knee at the shrine for the control of which he so valiantly battled. He finally concluded a truce of three years and eight months with Saladin, which provided that the Christians during that period should have free access to the holy places, and remain in undisturbed possession of the coast from Acre to Ascalon.

Refusing even to look upon the city which he could not win with his sword, Richard now set out for home. But while traversing Germany in disguise, he was discovered, and was arrested and imprisoned by order of the emperor Henry VI, who was his political enemy. Henry cast his prisoner into a dungeon, and notwithstanding the outcry of all Europe that the champion of Christianity should suffer such treatment at the hands of a brother prince, refused to release him without an enormous ransom.

The English people, so great was their admiration for the hero whose prowess had reflected such luster upon English knighthood, set themselves to raise the sum demanded, even stripping the churches of their plate to make up the amount; and the lion-hearted crusader was at last set free, and finally reached England, where he was received with wild acclamation.

V. The Fourth Crusade[7] (1202–1204)

212. The Crusaders bargain with the Venetians. — The rendezvous of this expedition was the city of Venice. Those participating in it were mostly adventurers.

It was determined to proceed by sea to Egypt, and a contract was accordingly made with the Venetians for vessels and supplies for the voyage. But unfortunately the crusaders had promised to pay a larger sum than they were able to raise, and even after the nobles had given up their plate and ornaments, they still lacked a large amount.

The Venetians now proposed in lieu of money to accept the aid of the crusaders in punishing the recent revolt of the city of Zara in Dalmatia, upon the eastern shore of the Adriatic. The crusaders consented, being very ready to pay a debt by the loan of their swords. The pope was very much angered that they should thus turn aside from the object of the expedition, and threatened them with the anathemas of the Church, but without effect. They rendered the proposed assistance, and thus discharged their obligation to the Venetians — and secured some booty besides.

213. Capture of Constantinople by the Latins (1204). — An event which happened just at this time at Constantinople turned the faces of the crusaders towards that city instead of

[7] During the years 1196–1197 an army composed chiefly of Germans was making its way to Syria and engaging in operations there. This enterprise was set on foot by Henry VI of Germany, whose untimely death caused the break-up and virtual failure of the expedition. This undertaking is sometimes reckoned as the Fourth Crusade, and thus the number increased to nine.

towards Egypt. A revolt had placed a usurper upon the Byzantine throne. Alexius Angelus, a son of the deposed emperor, besought the aid of the Frankish warriors against the usurper. Various motives caused them to listen favorably to his appeal. The Venetians, headed by the old and blind doge, Henry Dandolo, seeing in the enterprise an opportunity to further their commercial interests, also joined their forces to those of the crusaders. The armament, consisting of over three hundred ships, sailed for Constantinople. The city was taken by storm, and Isaac II, the father of the exiled prince Alexius, was invested with the imperial authority.

Scarcely were matters thus arranged before the turbulent Greeks engaged in a revolt which resulted in the death of both Isaac and his son. The crusaders, who seem by this time to have quite forgotten the object for which they had originally set out, now resolved to take possession of the capital, and set a Latin prince on the throne of Constantinople. The determination was carried out. Constantinople was taken a second time by storm, and sacked amidst horrid orgies. Baldwin of Flanders was crowned Emperor of the East and installed in the ruined capital (1204).

Three-eighths of the empire were reserved as the share of the republic of Venice. This reservation consisted wholly of shore lands and islands. A great part of the remainder of the empire was allotted to different Frankish knights, who, after first conquering the lands assigned them, were to hold them as fiefs of the new empire of Romania.

One of the most interesting of the feudal principalities that arose on the ruins of the dismembered empire was the dukedom of Athens. Hundreds of Western knights assembled at this capital of ancient culture, and created there a brilliant feudal court which completely captivated the imagination of Europe. "From these Latin princes of the fourteenth century, Boccace (Boccaccio), Chaucer, and Shakespeare have borrowed their Theseus, *Duke* of Athens. An ignorant age

transfers its own language and manners to the most distant times." [8]

214. Lamentable Results of the Sack of Constantinople. — A most regrettable result of the sack of Constantinople by the crusaders was the destruction of the numerous masterpieces of art with which the city was crowded; for Constantinople had been for nine centuries the chief place of safe deposit for the priceless art treasures of the ancient world. The extent of the loss suffered by art in the ruthless sack of the city will never be known. It would seem as though almost all the bronze and silver statues, and all the ornamental metal work of the churches and other edifices of the city went into the melting-pot.

Still another lamentable consequence of the crusaders' act was the weakening of the military strength of the capital. For a thousand years Constantinople had been the great bulwark of Western civilization against Asiatic barbarism. Its power of resistance was now broken, with momentous consequences for Western Christendom, as we shall learn later (chap. xv).

The Latin empire of Constantinople, as it was called, lasted only a little over half a century (1204–1261). The Greeks, at the end of this period, succeeded in regaining the throne, which they then held until the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453.

VI. The Children's Crusade; Minor Crusades

215. The Children's Crusade (1212). — During the interval between the Fourth and the Fifth Crusade, the religious enthusiasm that had so long agitated the men of Europe came to fill with unrest the children, resulting in what is known as the Children's Crusade.

[8] Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. lxii, note 53; quoted by Finlay, *History of Greece*, vol. iii, p. 172. Recall Chaucer's Knight's Tale of *Palamon and Arcite* and Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

The chief preacher of this crusade was a child about twelve years of age, a French peasant lad, named Stephen, who became persuaded that Jesus Christ had commanded him to lead a crusade of children to the rescue of the Holy Sepulcher. The children became wild with excitement, and flocked in vast crowds to the places appointed for rendezvous. Nothing could restrain them or thwart their purpose. "Even bolts and bars," says an old chronicler, "could not hold them." The great majority of those who collected at the rallying places were boys under twelve years of age, but there were also many girls.

The movement excited the most diverse views. Some declared that it was inspired by the Holy Spirit, and quoted such scriptural texts as these to justify the enthusiasm: "A child shall lead them"; "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast ordained praise." Others, however, were quite as confident that the whole thing was the work of the devil.

The German children, whose number is variously estimated from twenty to forty thousand, were the first to move. They crossed the Alps and marched down the Italian shores looking for a miraculous pathway through the sea to Palestine. Beneath the toil and hardships of the journey a great part of the little crusaders died or fell out by the way. Those reaching Rome were kindly received by the pope, who persuaded them to give up their enterprise and return to their homes, impressing upon their minds, however, that they could not be released from the vows they had made, which they must fulfill when they became men.

The French children, numbering thirty thousand, according to the chroniclers, set out from the place of rendezvous for Marseilles. Their leader, Stephen, rode in great state in a chariot surrounded by an escort of infantile nobles, who paid him the obedience and homage due a superior and sacred being. The little pilgrims had no conception of the distance to the Holy Land, and whenever a city came in sight eagerly asked if it were not Jerusalem.

Arriving at Marseilles, the children were bitterly disappointed that the sea did not open and give them passage to Palestine. The greater part, discouraged and disillusioned, now returned home; five or six thousand, however, accepting gladly the seemingly generous offer of two merchants of the city, who proposed to take them to the Holy Land free of charge, crowded into seven small ships and sailed out of the port of Marseilles. But they were betrayed and sold as slaves in Alexandria and other Mohammedan slave markets. A part of them, however, escaped this fate, having perished in the shipwreck of two of the vessels that bore them from Marseilles.[9]

This children's expedition marked at once the culmination and the decline of the crusading movement. The fervid zeal that inspired the first crusaders was already dying out. "These children," said the pope, referring to the young crusaders, "reproach us with having fallen asleep, whilst they were flying to the assistance of the Holy Land."

216. The Minor Crusades; End of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. — The last four expeditions — the Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth[10] — undertaken by the Christians of Europe against the infidels of the East may be conveniently grouped

[9] The credibility of that part of the account which deals with the fate of the French children has been questioned, but there is really no ground for rejecting it. See Kugler, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, p. 307 and note.

[10] The *Fifth Crusade* (1216–1220) was led by the kings of Hungary and Cyprus. Its strength was wasted in Egypt, and it resulted in nothing. The *Sixth Crusade* (1227–1229), headed by Frederick II of Germany, succeeded in securing from the Saracens the restoration of Jerusalem, together with several other cities of Palestine. The *Seventh Crusade* (1249–1254) was under the lead of Louis IX of France, surnamed the Saint. It met with disaster in Egypt. The *Eighth Crusade* (1270–1272) was incited by the fresh misfortunes that, towards the close of the thirteenth century, befell the Christian kingdom in Palestine. The two principal leaders of the expedition were Louis IX of France and Prince Edward of England, afterwards Edward I. Louis directed his forces against the Moors about Tunis, in North Africa. Here the king died of the plague. Nothing was effected by this division of the expedition. The division led by the English prince was, however, more fortunate. Edward succeeded in capturing Nazareth, and in compelling the sultan of Egypt to agree to a treaty favorable to the Christians (1272).

as the Minor Crusades. They were marked by a less genuine enthusiasm than that which characterized particularly the First Crusade, and exhibited among those taking part in them the greatest variety of objects and ambitions. The flame of the Crusades had burned itself out, and the fate of the little Christian kingdom in Asia, isolated from Europe, surrounded on all sides by bitter enemies, and unfortunately weakened by internal feuds, became each day more and more apparent. Finally the last of the places (Acre) held by the Christians fell before the attacks of the Mamelukes of Egypt, and with this event the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem came to an end (1291). The second great combat between Mohammedanism and Christianity was over, and "silence reigned along the shore that had so long resounded with the world's debate."

217. Withdrawal of the Military Orders from Syria. — The knights of the religious military orders that had originated in Palestine during the heroic age of the Crusades retired mournfully from the land which all their prodigies of valor had been unable to protect from the profanation of the infidel, and sought elsewhere new seats for their fraternities, whence they might still sally forth to battle with the enemies of the Cross.

The Hospitalers retreated first to the island of Cyprus, but afterwards established themselves in the island of Rhodes, where for more than two centuries the valiant and devoted members of the order were the strongest bulwark of Christian Europe against the advance in that quarter of the Moslem power towards the West. Driven at last from this island by the Turks, they eventually retired to the island of Malta (1530). In their gallant defense of this rock against their old enemy, they gained not only fresh fame, but a new name, becoming known as the Knights of Malta. Upon this island the order lived on till the French Revolution, "the last relic of the age of the crusaders and of chivalry."

The Teutonic Knights found a new seat for their order in Northeastern Europe, where members of the fraternity were already laying in part the foundations of the future state of Prussia (par. 220). At the opening of the Reformation the lands they had acquired in these parts were secularized, and the brotherhood ceased to exist as a political power.

The story of the Templar Knights is short and tragic. We shall find place to narrate it in another connection (par. 343).

VII. Crusades in Europe

218. General Statement. — Notwithstanding the strenuous and united efforts which the Christians of Europe put forth against the Mohammedans, they did not succeed in extending permanently the frontiers of Western civilization in the Orient.

But in the southwest and the northeast of Europe it was different. Here the crusading spirit rescued from Moslem and pagan large territories, and upon these regained or newly acquired lands established a number of little Christian principalities, which later grew into states, or came to form a portion of states, which were to play great parts in the history of the following centuries. The states whose beginnings are thus connected with the crusading age are Portugal, Spain, and Prussia. We will say just a single word respecting each of them.

219. Crusades against the Moors in the Iberian Peninsula. — Just before the actual beginning of the crusades against the Moslems of the East a band of northern knights, of which one of the leaders was Henry of Burgundy, went to the help of the Christians against the Moslems in the west of the Iberian peninsula. The issue of this chivalric enterprise was the formation of a little feudal principality, the nucleus of the later kingdom of Portugal. At the time of the Second Crusade some German and English crusaders, on their way to Palestine by sea, stopped here and aided the native Christians in the siege and capture from the Mohammedans of the important

city of Lisbon (1147). This gave the little growing state its future capital. Thus Portugal was, in a very strict sense, a creation of the crusading spirit.

Then during all the time that the Crusades proper were going on in the Eastern Mediterranean, the Spanish Christian knights were engaged in almost one uninterrupted crusade against the Moslems established in the peninsula. The Moors received aid from their co-religionists of Africa; the Spanish Christians were assisted by volunteers from the Christian lands of the North, particularly from France.

By the middle of the thirteenth century the Christians had crowded the Moors into a small region in the southern part of the peninsula, where they maintained themselves until the very close of the Middle Ages. Upon the ground thus regained for Christendom there arose a number of small Christian states which finally coalesced to form the modern kingdom of Spain. The circumstances of the origin of this kingdom left a deep impress upon all its subsequent history.[11]

220. Crusades by the Teutonic Knights against the Pagan Slavs (1226–1283). — At the time of the Crusades all the Baltic shore lands lying eastward of the Vistula and which to-day form a part of Prussia were held by pagan Slavs. These people, like the pagan Saxons of an earlier time (par. 101), resisted strenuously the introduction of Christianity among them. Devoted priests who carried the Gospel to them, together with the converts they made, were often massacred. Finally a crusade was preached against them.

Early in the thirteenth century (1226) some knights of the Teutonic order transferred their crusading efforts to these northern heathen lands. For the greater part of the century the knights carried on what was a desperate and almost continuous war of extermination against the pagans. Upon the land

[11] For the effect upon the Spanish national character of the long religious wars out of which the Spanish nation arose, see par. 355.

wrested from them were founded the important fortress-cities of Königsberg and Marienburg. The surrounding Slav population was either destroyed or subjected, and the whole land was gradually Germanized. Thus what was originally Slav territory was converted into a German land, and the basis laid of a principality which later came to form an important part of modern Prussia.[12] Thus the crusading zeal of the knight-monks contributed to the creation of one of the strongest of modern European states.

221. Crusades against the Albigenses (1209–1229). — During the crusading age holy wars were preached and waged against heretics as well as against infidels and pagans.

In the south of France, which country since the settlement of Marseilles by the Greeks in the sixth century B.C. had been open, by way of the sea, to Hellenic, Roman, and Saracenic influences, was a sect of Christians called Albigenses,[13] who had departed so far from the orthodox faith that Pope Innocent III declared them to be "more wicked than Saracens." He therefore, after a vain endeavor to turn them from their errors, called upon the French king, Philip II, and his nobles to lead a crusade against the heretics and their rich and powerful patron, Raymond VI, count of Toulouse.

The king held aloof from the enterprise, being fully occupied watching his own enemies; but a great number of his nobles responded eagerly to the call of the Church. The leader of the first crusade (1209–1213) was Simon de Montfort, a man cruel, callous, and relentless beyond belief. A great part of Languedoc, the beautiful country of the Albigenses, was made a desert, the inhabitants being slaughtered and the cities

[12] "Thus was effected the last great expansion of Germany to the east" (Tout, *The Empire and the Papacy*, p. 380). See on map of Europe how the German territory on the northeast is thrust out into the Slavonic mass.

[13] From *Albi*, the name of a city and district in which their tenets prevailed.

burned. The extent of the devastation created may be inferred from the fact that upon the capture of a single town, Béziers by name, thirty thousand persons, men, women, and children, were slain.[14]

In 1229 the fury of a fresh crusade burst upon the Albigenses, which resulted in their prince (Raymond VII) ceding the greater part of his beautiful but ravaged provinces to Louis IX, king of France, and submitting himself to the Church. The Albigensian heresy was soon wholly extirpated by the tribunal of the Inquisition which was set up in the country.

VIII. The End of the Crusades; their Influence on European Civilization

222. Why the Crusades ceased. — We have said that the main cause which set the Crusades in motion was religious enthusiasm. Their cessation was due principally to the dying out of this holy zeal.

Even long before the last of the Crusades the views of the Western Christians respecting them had materially changed. As it would be utterly impossible to awaken to-day any enthusiasm among the European nations for such undertakings, so by the opening of the fourteenth century it had become very difficult to get the people to take much interest in the matter. This change in feeling was a result of the general advance of the peoples of Europe in knowledge and culture, and the growth among them of a more tolerant spirit, due largely, as we shall see when we come to speak of the effects of the Crusades, to these very movements themselves.

[14] It is said that before the massacre one of the crusaders asked an ecclesiastic, the abbot of Citeaux, how the soldiers were to distinguish the heretics from the true believers. "Kill them all," he is said to have replied; "the Lord will know his own." The credibility of this story has been called in question, since it rests upon the authority of a single chronicler. See Alzog, *Universal Church History*, vol. ii, p. 666.

And then the barbarian love of martial adventure, — which we gave as a powerful auxiliary cause of the Crusades, — as mediæval society was slowly transformed by those feelings and sentiments that distinguish modern society, was superseded by the industrial and commercial spirit. The ambitious and aspiring began to think it wiser to make fortunes through trade, manufacture, and maritime enterprise, than to squander them in costly expeditions for the recovery of holy places. The trader with his practical views of life took the place of the knight with his romantic ideals.

223. Their Effects upon the Papacy and the Monastic Orders. — The Crusades exerted indirectly such an influence upon the institutions and the life of the peoples of Western Europe that they constitute a great landmark in the history of civilization. To show this to be so, and also to give unity and coherence to our narrative by connecting these enterprises with the later general course and progress of mediæval history, we shall now proceed to speak briefly of their effects upon the ecclesiastical, the commercial, the social, the intellectual, and the political life of Western Christendom. We speak first of the effects of the crusading movement upon the institutions of the Church.

Without doubt the Crusades tended to enhance the power of the papacy. Thus the prominent part which the popes took in these enterprises naturally fostered their authority and influence, by placing in their hands, as it were, the armies and resources of Christendom, and by accustoming the people to look to them as guides and leaders. The papal power was also materially strengthened by the military orders of monks called into existence by the crusading enthusiasm; for these orders, speaking generally, upheld the papal authority as opposed to that of the episcopate.

As to the monasteries, their wealth was augmented enormously by the sale to them, for a mere fraction of their actual value, of the estates of those preparing for the expeditions, or

by the out-and-out gift of the lands of such in return for prayers and pious blessings. Often, too, religious houses were made the guardians of the property of crusaders during their absence, which death left in the hands of these fraternities. Again, thousands, returning broken in spirit and in health, sought an asylum in cloistral retreats, and endowed with all their worldly goods the establishments they entered. Besides all this, the stream of the ordinary gifts of piety was swollen, by the extraordinary fervor of religious enthusiasm which characterized the period, into prodigious proportions.

Thus were augmented the power of the papacy and the riches of the monasteries. In the end this increase in power and wealth proved disastrous both to the popes and to the monks. The enhancement of the papal authority intensified the apprehension and the opposition of the lay princes of Europe, and thus gave a fresh impulse to that struggle which had already begun between the temporal and the spiritual authority, and which finally resulted in the crippling of the papal power (chap. xiv). The enormous growth in wealth of the monasteries led to the moral degeneracy of the monks, and thus paved the way for the decay and downfall of the monastic system.

224. Their Effect upon the Eastern Empire. — Among the most noteworthy results of the Crusades we may place the preservation for a time of Constantinople.[15] The shock of the First Crusade rolled back the tide of Turkish conquest, and thus postponed the fall of the Eastern empire, or at least of its capital, for three centuries and more. This postponement of the conquest of Southeastern Europe by Asiatic hordes would in itself be a matter of only secondary importance; but this delay gave the young Christian civilization of Central

[15] But for the crime of the men of the Fourth Crusade (par. 214), the Eastern *emperors might* possibly have been able to hold the Bosporus indefinitely *against the* Ottoman Turks.

Europe time sufficient to consolidate its strength into an impregnable bulwark before the returning tide of Mohammedan invasion swept in again upon Christendom. It is altogether probable that, had the Seljuk Turks been allowed to cross the Bosporus in the twelfth century, they would have carried their conquests much farther towards the West than their kinsmen, the Osmanli, were able to do in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (see chap. xv).

Furthermore, the fall of Constantinople in the twelfth century would have meant probably the permanent loss to civilization of all the literary treasures the city was holding in safe-keeping for civilization; for the West was not yet ready, as is shown by the vandalism of the men of the Fourth Crusade, to become the appreciative and reverent guardians of this precious bequest.

225. Their Effects upon the Towns and upon Commerce and Society. — The towns gained many political advantages at the expense of the crusading barons and princes. Ready money in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was largely in the hands of the burgher class, and in return for the contributions and loans they made to their overlords or suzerains, they received charters conferring special and valuable privileges. Thus, while power and wealth were slipping out of the hands of the nobility, the cities and towns were growing in political importance and making great gains in the matter of municipal freedom.

The Holy Wars further promoted the prosperity of the towns by giving a great impulse to commercial enterprise and by widening trade relations. During this period, Venice, Pisa, and Genoa acquired great wealth and reputation through the fostering of their trade by the needs of the crusaders and the opening up of the East. The Mediterranean was whitened with the sails of their transport ships, which were constantly plying between the various ports of Europe and the towns of the Syrian coast. Also, various arts, manufactures, and

inventions (among these the windmill[16]) before unknown in Europe were introduced from Asia. This enrichment of the civilization of the West with the "spoils of the East" we may allow to be emblemized by the famous bronze horses that the crusaders carried off from Constantinople and set up before Saint Mark's Cathedral in Venice.

The effects of the Crusades upon the social life of the Western nations were marked and important. Giving opportunity for romantic adventure, they aided powerfully in the development of that institution of knighthood which, whatever may have been the extravagances and follies into which its members at last fell, was the home in which were nourished, as we have seen, many of the noblest virtues and most exalted sentiments of modern society (par. 163). And under this head must be placed the general refining influence that contact with the more cultured nations of the East had upon the semi-barbarous people of the West. The rude Frankish warriors looked with astonishment upon the luxury of the Greeks, and especially upon the magnificence displayed by the Saracen chiefs, whom they had imagined to be as barbarous in manners as perverted in faith.

These influences, which we designate the social, were felt of course in the country as well as in the town, but their more permanent impress was probably left upon the life of the urban communities.

226. Their Effects upon the Intellectual Life of Europe. — The influence of the Crusades upon the general intellectual development of Europe can hardly be overestimated. Above all, they liberalized the minds of the crusaders. At the commencement of the expeditions the Christians entertained sentiments of the bitterest hate and intolerance towards the Moslem infidels, whom they verily thought to be the "Children

[16] Windmills were chiefly utilized in the Netherlands, where they were used to pump the water from the oversoaked lands, and thus became the means of creating the most important part of what is now the kingdom of Holland.

of Hell"; but before the close of the Crusades we find that they have come to hold very different views respecting their antagonists. During the Third Crusade the Saracen chiefs were frequent guests at Richard's table, and the Christian knights were recipients of the same courtesy in the tent of the chivalrous Saladin. In a word, the voyages, observations, and experiences of the crusaders had just that effect in correcting their false notions, and in liberalizing their narrow and intolerant ideas, that wide travel and close contact with different peoples and races never fail of producing upon even the dullest and most bigoted person.

Furthermore, the knowledge of geography,[17] and of the science and learning of the East, gained by the crusaders through their expeditions, greatly stimulated the Latin intellect, and helped to awaken in Western Europe that mental activity which resulted finally in the great intellectual outburst known as the Renaissance (chap. xviii).

In no realm were the effects of the Crusades more positive than in the field of literature. From the East was brought in a vast amount of fresh literary material, consisting of the traditions of great events like the siege of Troy, and of great heroes, such as Solomon and Alexander the Great. These legends, exaggerated and distorted and curiously mingled with the folklore of the Western peoples, came now to form the basis of a vast literature consisting of chronicles, romances, epic poems, and pious tales, infinite in variety and form. In this way the literatures of Europe were enriched and their growth greatly stimulated.

227. Their Political Effects. — The Crusades, as we have noticed in another connection (par. 153), helped to break down the power of the feudal aristocracy and give prominence to the

[17] "If I were asked," says Sismondi, as quoted by Stillé, "what was the knowledge acquired during the Middle Ages which did most to quicken and develop the intelligence of that time, I should say, without the slightest hesitation, the knowledge of geography acquired by the pilgrims to the Holy Land."

kings and the people. Many of the nobles who set out on the expeditions never returned, and their estates, through failure of heirs, escheated to the crown; while many more wasted their fortunes in meeting the expenses of their undertaking. Thus the nobility were greatly weakened in numbers and influence, and the power and patronage of the kings correspondingly increased.

This process of the disintegration of feudalism and the growth of monarchy is to be traced most distinctly in France, the cradle and center of the crusading movement. That the Crusades contributed to the growth of the royal power in any other country of the West cannot be asserted with any degree of assurance. They seem, however, to have quickened the national consciousness not only in France, but also in England and in Germany, and thus to have promoted that movement which we shall speak of later under the head of the growth of the nations (chap. xix). This national consciousness, by which we mean substantially national patriotism, was stimulated by the comradeship of the camp, and by the participation of the crusaders in common dangers and common achievements, as well as by the mutual rivalries of the different national contingents forming the crusading armies.

The laying of the foundations of the later states of Portugal, Spain, and Prussia should also be noticed here as showing how the Crusades helped to create the political map of modern Europe. It is the practical continuation of the Crusades in Southeastern Europe that has in our own day called into existence several little Christian states in the Balkan peninsula.

228. Their Influence on Geographical Discovery. — Lastly, the incentive given to geographical exploration led various travelers, such as the celebrated Venetian Marco Polo, to range over the most remote countries of Asia. Nor did the matter end here. Even that spirit of maritime enterprise and adventure which rendered illustrious the close of the Middle *Ages, inspiring* the voyages of Columbus, Vasco da Gama, and

Magellan, may be traced back to that lively interest in geographical matters, that curiosity respecting the remote regions of the earth, awakened by the expeditions of the crusaders.[18]

These various growths and movements, ecclesiastical, commercial, social, intellectual, political, and geographical, in European society, which, though not originated by the Crusades, were nevertheless given a fresh impulse by them, we shall trace out in the following chapters, beginning with the papacy.

Sources and Source Material. — *Chronicles of the Crusades* (Bohn). This volume embraces translations of three chronicles bearing on the Crusades. The first is by Richard of Devizes and the second by Geoffrey de Vinsauf. Both detail the part taken by King Richard I in the Third Crusade. The chronicle by Geoffrey is the more valuable one, since the chronicler writes as an eyewitness of the scenes he depicts. The third chronicle is by Joinville, who accompanied Saint Louis on his expedition to Egypt and Palestine. Archer's *Crusade of Richard I* (English History by Contemporary Writers). *Translations and Reprints* (Univ. of Penn.), vol. i, No. 2, "Urban and the Crusaders," and No. 4, "Letters of the Crusaders"; also vol. iii, No. 1, "The Fourth Crusade." Henderson's *Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, p. 208, "Decree of the Emperor Henry IV concerning a Truce of God (1085)." *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, 2 vols., translated and edited by Henry Yule (2d. ed., London, 1875). These unique volumes of travel and observation illustrate how the Crusades widened the geographical horizon of the European world, and particularly how they "opened the world towards the East." Also by the same editor, *Cathay and the way thither*.

Secondary or Modern Works. — Modern works on the Crusades are very numerous. The following are among the best in English. SYBEL (H. VON), *The History and Literature of the Crusades* (trans. from the German). For the mature reader. BURR (G. L.), *The Year*

[18] Colonel Henry Yule, speaking of the influence of the travels and writings of Marco Polo, says: "The spur which his book eventually gave to geographical studies, and the beacon which it hung out at the eastern extremities of the earth, helped to guide the aims . . . of the greater son of the rival republic. His work was at least a link in the providential chain which at last dragged the New World to light." — Introduction to *The Book of Ser Marco Polo* (London, 1875), p. 103.

1000 and the Antecedents of the Crusades (in *Am. Hist. Rev.* for April, 1901, vol. vi, No. 3). Shows the unhistorical character of the tradition of the "millennial terror." ARCHER (T. A.) and KINGSFORD (C. L.), ** *The Crusades* (Story of the Nations). The founding and the fortunes of the Latin kingdom at Jerusalem are made the matters of chief interest. The critical reader will correct the error on p. xiv in regard to the "fateful year 1000." COX (G. W.), *The Crusades* (Epochs series). EMERTON (E.), *Mediæval Europe*, chap. xi, "The Crusades." ADAMS (G. B.), *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. xi, "The Crusades." MICHAUD (J. F.), *History of the Crusades* (from the French), 3 vols. Very interesting, but in part discredited through a new appraisement of the trustworthiness of the sources for the Crusades. PEARS (E.), ** *The Fall of Constantinople*. The best account of the Fourth Crusade. GRAY (G. Z.), *The Children's Crusade* (new ed., Boston, 1900). A narrative that will be sure to interest young readers. MOMBERT (J. I.), *A Short History of the Crusades*. Not so fine a piece of work as the same author's "Charles the Great." OMAN (C.), *The Art of War in the Middle Ages*. Also the same author's *Byzantine Empire* (Story of the Nations), chaps. xxi and xxii. Particularly for the Fourth Crusade; the work supplements Archer's. GUIZOT (F. G. P.), ** *History of Civilization in Europe* (ed. by George Wells Knight), lect. viii. Gives a succinct account of the causes and results of the Crusades. PERRY (F.), *Saint Louis* (Heroes of the Nations). KITCHIN (G. W.), *History of France*, vol. i, bk. iii, chap. iii, pp. 216–240. Excellent, particularly in its review of the effects of the crusading movement. STORRS (R. S.), *Bernard of Clairvaux*. A stately biography of the preacher of the Second Crusade. Shows the depth and force of the religious movement of the times. MORISON (J. C.), ** *The Life and Times of Saint Bernard*, bk. iv, particularly chaps. ii and iii, entitled respectively "The Second Crusade preached by Saint Bernard" and "The Second Crusade." LECKY (W. E. H.), *History of European Morals*, vol. ii, pp. 248–254. For the development of the military spirit in the Church. TOUT (T. F.), *The Empire and the Papacy*, chap. viii. An excellent summary. GIBBON (E.), *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chaps. lviii–lxi. CUTTS (E. L.), *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1885), pp. 157–194, "The Pilgrims of the Middle Ages." LANE-POOLE (S.), *Saladin, and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Heroes of the Nations). FINLAY (G.), *History of Greece*. (Oxford, 1877; ed. by H. F. Tozer), vol. iii, pp. 219–280, "The Fall of the Byzantine Empire"; vol. iv, pp. 132–173, "Dukes of Athens."

CHAPTER XIV

SUPREMACY OF THE PAPACY; DECLINE OF ITS TEMPORAL POWER

229. Introductory: the Papacy at its Height. — In an earlier chapter on the empire and the papacy we related the beginnings of the contention for supremacy between pope and emperor. In the present chapter we shall first speak of the papacy at the height of its power, and then tell how, as the popes, with the empire ruined, seemed about to realize their ideal of a universal ecclesiastical and secular monarchy, their temporal power was shattered by a new opposing force, — the rising nations.

The temporary success of the papal party, and the virtual establishment for a time of a theocracy over Western Christendom, was due more than to aught else to the fortunate succession in the papal chair of great men all animated by the steady purpose of making supreme the authority of the Roman see. We have already noticed the work of some of these makers of the papacy, notably that of Pope Gregory VII. Gregory had many worthy successors. The most eminent of these were Alexander III (1159–1181) and Innocent III (1198–1216), under whom the power of the papacy was at its height.

In the paragraphs immediately following we shall glance at some of the events which signalized the pontificates of these representatives of the papal supremacy. The events we shall touch upon are those which record the triumph of the papacy first over the empire and then over the kings of France and England.

230. Pope Alexander III and Emperor Frederick Barbarossa. —A little after the settlement known as the Concordat of Worms (par. 185) the first of the house of Hohenstaufen came to the German throne, and then began a fierce contention, lasting, with intervals of strained peace, for more than a century, between the emperors of this proud family and the successive occupants of the papal chair. This contest was practically the continuation, although under changed conditions of course, of the struggle begun long before to decide which should be supreme, the "world-priest" or the "world-king."

The contention filled Germany and Italy, all the lands over which the emperors claimed supremacy, with turmoil and violence. The story of the struggle, given with any detail, would fill many volumes. In the present connection we can do no more than simply note the issue of the quarrel, in so far as it concerned Pope Alexander III and one of the most noted of the Hohenstaufen, Frederick Barbarossa.

In his struggle with the emperor, the pope had as allies the Eastern emperor, the king of Sicily, and, above all others in importance to him, the Lombard cities, who were rebellious towards Frederick because of his assertion and harsh exercise of imperial rights over them. After maintaining the contest for many years Frederick, vanquished and humiliated, was constrained to seek reconciliation with the pope. Then followed the Peace of Venice (1177) with its dramatic incidents. In front of Saint Mark's Cathedral, in the presence of a vast throng, Frederick, overwhelmed by a sudden emotion of awe and reverence, cast off his mantle and flung himself at the feet of the venerable pontiff, who raised him from the ground and gave him the kiss of peace. That was for the imperial power its second Canossa. Precisely one hundred years had passed since the humiliation of the emperor Henry IV.[1]

[1] See par. 184. For further notice of Frederick Barbarossa's reign, see pars. 258 and 366.

231. Pope Innocent III and Philip Augustus of France. — When one of the most powerful and self-reliant of all the emperors after Charles the Great was forced thus to bow before the papal throne, we are not surprised to find the kings of the different countries of Europe subjecting themselves obediently to the same all-pervading authority. French and English history, of the period covered by the pontificate of Innocent III, each affords a striking illustration of the subject relation which the sovereigns of Europe had come to sustain to the papal see.

The French throne was at this time held by Philip Augustus (1180–1223). On some pretext Philip had put away his wife and entered into another marriage alliance. Pope Innocent III, as the censor of the morals of kings as well as of the morals of their subjects, commanded him to take back his discarded queen, and upon his refusal to do so, laid France under an interdict. Philip was finally constrained to yield obedience to the pope.

This triumph of the papal see over so strong and imperious a sovereign has been pronounced "the proudest trophy in the scutcheon of Rome."

232. Pope Innocent III and King John of England. — The story of Innocent's triumph over King John (1199–1216) of England is familiar. The see of Canterbury falling vacant, John ordered the monks who had the right of election to give the place to a favorite of his. They obeyed; but the pope immediately declared the election void, and caused the vacancy to be filled with one of his own friends, Stephen Langton. John declared that the pope's archbishop should never enter England as primate, and proceeded to confiscate the estates of the see. Innocent now laid all England under an interdict, excommunicated John, and incited the French king, Philip Augustus, to undertake a crusade against the contumacious rebel.

The outcome of the matter was that John was compelled to yield to the power of the Church. He gave back the lands he

had confiscated, acknowledged Langton to be the rightful primate of England, and even went so far as to give England and Ireland to the pope, receiving them back as a perpetual fief (1213). In token of his vassalage he agreed to pay to the papal see the annual sum of one thousand marks sterling. This tribute money was actually paid, though irregularly, until the reign of Edward III (par. 237).

233. The Mendicant Orders, or Begging Friars.[2] — The immediate successors of Innocent III found a strong support for their authority in two new monastic orders known as the Dominican and the Franciscan. They were so named after their respective founders, Saint Dominic (1170–1221) of Old Castile and Saint Francis (about 1182–1226) of Assisi, in Italy. The principles on which these fraternities were established were very different from those which had shaped all previous monastic orders. Until now the monk had sought cloistral solitude primarily in order to escape from the world, and through penance and prayer and contemplation to work out his own salvation. In the new orders, the members, instead of withdrawing from the world, were to remain in it, and give themselves wholly to the work of securing the salvation of others.

Again, the orders were also as *orders* to renounce all earthly possessions, and, "espousing Poverty as a bride," to rely entirely for support upon the daily and voluntary alms of the pious.[3] Hitherto, while the individual members of a monastic order must affect extreme poverty, the house or fraternity might possess any amount of communal wealth. This had led to indolence and laxity of discipline, and the espousal of poverty

[2] From *fratres*, *frères*, "brethren."

[3] The Mendicant Friars did not long rely wholly upon the "voluntary system" for support. They came to interpret their vow of poverty more liberally, and believed that they met its obligations when they put the title of the property they acquired in the hands of the pope, while they themselves simply enjoyed the use of it. The new fraternities grew in time to be among the richest of the monastic orders.

by the new brotherhood was a protest against the luxurious vices of the old orders.

There was at first a wide difference between the two fraternities. Saint Francis and the disciples whom his boundless self-sacrificing charity drew about him devoted themselves, in imitation of Christ and the apostles, to preaching the gospel to the poor and outcast, and to visiting those who were sick and in prison. This character of the activities of the early Franciscans has led to their being likened to the Salvation Army of our own day.[4]

Saint Dominic made his appeal to the higher and cultured class. He conceived his mission to be the combating of heresy, with which the intellectual ferment of the times had begun to fill Christendom.

These different tendencies of the two great founders are tersely expressed in the respective titles given them: Saint Francis was called the "Father of the poor," Saint Dominic the "Hammer of the heretics." But notwithstanding that the differing genius of the two saints left at first a distinct impress upon their respective orders, still each fraternity in time borrowed much from the other and the two finally became very much alike.

The new fraternities grew and spread with marvelous rapidity, illustrating anew the power of genuine self-abnegation and sympathy, and in less than a generation they had quite overshadowed all the old monastic orders of the Church, as well as the regular clergy, who were hostile to them. But that which it alone concerns us especially to notice in the present connection is the relation of the new orders to the papacy. The popes conferred upon them many and special privileges, and gradually freed them from all episcopal control. They in turn became the staunchest friends and supporters of the Roman

[4] Canon Jessopp well says of the founder of the Franciscan Order, "Saint Francis was the John Wesley of the thirteenth century whom the Church did not cast out."— *The Coming of the Friars*, p. 47.

see. They formed what has been called the militia of the popes. More accurately, they formed a regular, well-drilled, obedient papal soldiery, occupying every point of vantage in Western Christendom. They were to the papacy of the thirteenth century what the Benedictines had been to Pope Gregory VII, or what the later order of the Jesuits was to be to the papal Church of the period of the Reformation.

234. The Papacy brings the Empire to Virtual Ruin. — We have just seen how the imperial power in the person of one of the greatest of the house of Hohenstaufen was humbled by the papal authority. We have now to witness the utter ruin of this proud house and the downfall of the empire as a real international force in European affairs.

The empire fell at the very moment of the culmination of its glory, if not of its power, under the Hohenstaufen Frederick II (1212–1250), whom the historian Freeman ventures to pronounce "the most gifted of the sons of men." No emperor before him had conceived a loftier ideal of the world-empire, nor had any of his predecessors, after the great Charles, by virtue of personal qualities imparted to the imperial office such glamour and brilliancy.

But there were many elements of weakness in the empire, — selfish ambitions among the German princes, rival aspirants for the imperial crown, national and municipal sentiment in Italy, and the jealousy of outside rulers. All these elements of discontent and opposition were utilized by the popes to effect the undoing of the emperor. Throughout his long reign, laboring much of the time under all the disabilities of an excommunicate and with his authority in every part of his extended dominions undermined by the hostile activity of the papal agents, the Mendicant Friars, Frederick fought for the maintenance of the dignity and supremacy of the imperial power. He died in 1250 with the heavy consciousness of failure. Pursued by the hostility of the popes, his posterity was extirpated root and branch.

After Frederick II the empire was never again a real world-power. But the emperors in maintaining so long the struggle with the papacy had given time for a new power to arise, which was destined to avenge them in the overthrow of the papacy as an international lay authority. This new power was the awakening nationalities.

235. The Revolt of the Nations. — The fourteenth century marks the turning point in the history of the temporal power of the papacy. In the course of that century the lay rulers in several of the leading countries of Europe, supported by their subjects, succeeded in regaining their lost independence. France, Germany, and England successively revolted against the papacy, — the expression is not too strong, — and formally denied the right of the pope to interfere in their political or governmental affairs.

But it should be carefully noted that the leaders of this revolt against the secular domination of the papacy did not think of challenging the spiritual authority and jurisdiction of the pope as the supreme head of the Church. Their attitude was wholly like that of the Italians of our own day, who, while dispossessing the pope of the last remnant of his temporal sovereignty, abate nothing of their veneration for him as the Vicar of God in all things moral and spiritual.

236. Pope Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair of France. — It was during the pontificate of Boniface VIII (1294–1303) that the secular authority of the popes received a severe blow and began rapidly to decline. Boniface had Gregory VII's exalted views of the prerogatives of the papal office. Taking as his warrant for the exercise of jurisdiction over all princes and kings these words of Scripture, "Behold I have set thee over kingdoms and empires," [5] he assumed an attitude towards the lay rulers which was certain to bring the ecclesiastical and civil authorities into angry and violent collision. In the year 1296 he issued a bull in which, under pain of

[5] Jer. i, 10.

excommunication, he forbade all ecclesiastical persons, without papal permission, to pay taxes in any form levied by lay rulers. All civil rulers of whatsoever name, baron, duke, prince, king, or emperor, who should presume to impose upon ecclesiastics taxes or imposts of any kind, were also to incur the same sentence.[6]

Philip of France regarded the papal claims as an encroachment upon the civil authority. The contention between him and the pope speedily grew into an acrimonious and undignified quarrel. In one of his letters to Boniface, Philip addressed the pontiff in words of unseemly and studied rudeness. Philip was bold because he knew that his people were with him. The popular feeling was given expression in a famous States-General which the king summoned in 1302, and in another called together the next year. The three estates of the realm, the nobility, the clergy, and the commons, declared that the pope had no authority in France in political matters; that the French king had no superior save God. To the maintenance of the ancient liberties of the French nation they pledged to Philip their fortunes and their lives.

The end was soon reached. At Anagni, in Italy, a band of soldiers in the French pay, with every indignity, accompanied by blows, made Boniface a prisoner. After three days he was set free by friends and returned to Rome, only, however, to be there made the victim of fresh insults. In a few days he died, broken-hearted, it is said, at the age of eighty-seven (1303).

By all historians of the rise and decline of the temporal power of the popes, the scene at Anagni is placed for historical instruction alongside that enacted more than two centuries earlier at Canossa (par. 184). The contrasted scenes cannot fail to impress deeply the thoughtful student of history with the vast vicissitudes in the fortunes of the mediæval papacy.

[6] This is the celebrated bull known as *Clericis Laicos*. See Henderson's *Select Historical Documents*, p. 432.

237. Removal of the Papal Seat to Avignon (1309–1376); **Revolt of Germany and England.** — In 1309, through the concurrence of various influences, the papal seat was removed from Rome to Avignon, in Provence, adjoining the frontier of France. Here it remained for a space of nearly seventy years, an era known in church history as the "Babylonian Captivity." While it was established here, all the popes were Frenchmen, and their policies were largely dictated by the French kings. "The migration to France," says Pastor, "the creation of a preponderance of French cardinals and the consequent election of seven French popes in succession, necessarily compromised the position of the papacy in the eyes of the world, creating a suspicion that the highest spiritual power had become the tool of France."

Thus the papacy lost that character of universality which had been the basis of its influence and strength. Under these circumstances it was but natural that outside of France there should be stirred up a more and more angry protest against the interference of the popes in civil matters.

The measures taken at this time by the national assemblies of Germany and England, in both of which countries a national sentiment was springing up, show how completely the papacy had lost prestige as an international power.

In 1338 the German princes with whom rested the right of electing the German king, in opposing the papal claims, declared that the German emperor derived all his powers from God through them and not from the pope. The German Diet endorsed this declaration, and the principle that the German emperor, as to his election and the exercise of his functions, is independent of the papal see became from that time forward a part of the German constitution.

A little later (in 1366), during the reign of Edward III, the English Parliament, acting in a like spirit and temper, put an end to English vassalage to Rome by formally refusing to pay the tribute pledged by King John,[7] and by repudiating

[7] See par. 232. The payment of this tribute had fallen into arrears,

wholly the claims of the popes upon England as a fief of the holy see.

238. The Great Schism (1378–1417). — The stirring of the national sentiment in several of the countries of Europe was not the only result of the Babylonian exile disastrous to the papacy. The removal of the papal court from Rome awakened great discontent in Italy. Rome without the pope was a widowed city. It was torn by rival factions, its buildings were falling into ruins, and cattle "were grazing even to the foot of the altar" in the churches of Saint Peter and the Lateran.[8]

The return of the popes to Rome was imperatively necessary if they were to retain any authority in Italy. Finally Pope Gregory XI was persuaded to break away from the influence of the French king and transfer the papal seat once more to the Eternal City. This was in 1377. The following year Gregory died, and the college of cardinals elected as his successor an Italian prelate, who took the name of Urban VI. The new pope unfortunately was of a harsh and imperious disposition. His discourteous treatment of the French cardinals angered them, and they, denying the validity of his election, set up an anti-pope, who under the name of Clement VII established his court at Avignon. Such was the beginning of the Great Schism (1378).

The spectacle of two rival popes, each claiming to be the rightful successor of Saint Peter and each anathematizing the other, naturally gave the reverence which the world had so generally held for the Roman see a rude shock, and one from which it never fully recovered.

239. The Church Councils of Pisa (1409) **and Constance** (1414–1418). — For the lifetime of a generation all Western Christendom was deeply agitated by the bitter and unseemly quarrel. No peaceful solution of the difficulty seemed possible. Some even favored a resort to force. The faculties of the University of Paris invited suggestions as to the best

[8] Pastor, *History of the Popes*, vol. i, p. 69.

means of ending the schism. They received ten thousand written opinions. The drift of these was in favor of an ecumenical council. Finally, in 1409, a council of the Church assembled at Pisa, for the purpose of composing the unfortunate feud. This council deposed both popes and elected Alexander V as the supreme head of the Church. But matters instead of being mended hereby were only made worse; for neither of the deposed pontiffs would lay down his authority in obedience to the demands of the council, and consequently there were now three popes instead of two.

In 1414 another council was called, at Constance, for the settlement of the growing dispute. One of the claimants resigned and the other two were deposed. A new pope was then elected, the choice of the assembly falling upon Cardinal Colonna, who became Pope Martin V (1417). In his person the Catholic world was again united under a single spiritual head. The schism was outwardly healed, but the wound had been too deep not to leave permanent traces upon the Church. Furthermore, the worldly and evil lives of some of the schismatic popes had cast ineffaceable stains upon the robes of the pontifical office.

The Roman pontiffs, although the battles of the lost cause were fought over again and again in different countries, were never able, after the events of the fourteenth century, to exercise such authority over the kings of Europe, or exact from them such obedience in civil affairs, as had been possible for the popes of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The splendid ideal of Hildebrand, though so nearly realized, had at last, as to one-half of what he purposed, proved an utter failure, — "the grandest and most magnificent failure in human history."

240. The Papacy remains a Spiritual Theocracy. — We say that the Roman pontiffs failed as to one-half their purpose; for while they failed to make good their supremacy in temporal affairs, they did succeed in establishing and perpetuating an absolute spiritual dominion, their plenary authority in all

matters of faith being to-day acknowledged by more than one-half of all those who bear the name of Christian.

The Council of Constance, indeed, decreed that the pope is subject to an ecumenical council, and that a decision of the Roman see may be appealed from to the judgment of the Church gathered in one of these great assemblies, which were to be convened at least every ten years. Thus the Church was for a moment practically converted into a limited monarchy; and perhaps if this form could actually have been impressed upon it, and general councils regularly convened, the Church might have gradually corrected those abuses that had crept into it, and the great popular revolt of the sixteenth century have been prevented. But Martin V, the pope elected by this same council, in opposition to its edicts, issued a bull declaring "it unlawful for any one either to appeal from the judgment of the apostolic see, or to reject its decisions in matters of faith." On the other hand, the Council of Basel, — the third and last of the great reforming councils of the fifteenth century, — which assembled in 1431, setting itself against the principle of papal autocracy, declared any one appealing from a general council of the Church to the pope to be guilty of heresy.

The papal party, the party of absolutism, carried the day. Only one ecumenical council has been held since the Council of Trent, which was called in 1545 to pronounce upon the doctrines of Luther; and this assembly (the Vatican Council, 1869–1870) promulgated the decisive edict of papal infallibility.

And thus the papacy, though its temporal power has been entirely taken from it, and its spiritual authority rejected in general by the northern nations, still remains, as Macaulay says, "not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigor." The pope is to-day, in the view of more than half of Christendom, the supreme and infallible head of a Church that, in the famous words of the brilliant writer just quoted, "was great and respected before the Saxon had set

foot on Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshiped in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveler from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of Saint Paul's." [9]

Sources and Source Material. — Henderson's *Select Historical Documents*, pp. 410–430, — a variety of documents illustrating the relation of papacy and empire during the reign of Frederick Barbarossa: p. 430, "John's Concession of England to the Pope"; p. 432, "The Bull 'Clericis Laicos'"; p. 435, "The Bull 'Unam Sanctam'"; and p. 437, "The Law 'Licet Juris' of the Frankfort Diet of 1338." *Translations and Reprints* (Univ. of Penn.), vol. iii, No. 6: documents and extracts under § iii, "Church and State"; and § iv, "The Council of Constance and its Antecedents." DANTE, *De Monarchia* (see above, p. 212) and *Divina Commedia.*

Secondary or Modern Works. — BRYCE (J.), *The Holy Roman Empire*, chap. xi, "The Emperors in Italy: Frederick Barbarossa," and chap. xiii, "Fall of the Hohenstaufen." PASTOR (L.), ** *The History of the Popes*, vol. i (Catholic; from the German). ADAMS (G. B.), ** *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. x, "The Empire and the Papacy" (last part), and chap. xvi, "The Papacy in the New Age." ALZOG (J.), *Universal Church History*, vol. ii, pp. 573–586, for Innocent III and his relations to the princes of Europe; and pp. 614–630, for Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair. BALZANI (U.), ** *The Popes and the Hohenstaufen* (Epochs of Church History). FISHER (G. P.), *History of the Christian Church*, pp. 240–264. TOUT (T. F.), *The Empire and the Papacy* (Periods of European History), chaps. xi, xiv, xvi, and xxi. KINGTON (T. L.), *History of Frederick the Second, Emperor of the Romans*, 2 vols. Freeman's *Historical Essays* (First Series), "Frederick II." RENAN (E.), *New Studies in Religious History* (New York, 1887), pp. 305–329; for a very suggestive essay on Francis of Assisi. JESSOPP (A.), *The Coming of the Friars.* LEA (H. C.), *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, vol. i, chap. vi, "The Mendicant Orders." CREIGHTON (M.), *History of the Papacy*, vol. i, "The Great Schism; The Council of Constance." WYLIE (J. H.), *The Council of Constance to the Death of John Hus.*

[9] Essay on "Von Ranke's History of the Popes."

CHAPTER XV

THE MONGOLS AND THE OTTOMAN TURKS

I. The Mongols

241. Introductory. — We have witnessed two invasions of civilized Europe, one by the Germanic tribes from the north and another by the Saracens from the south, and have noted the effects of each upon the course of general history. Our attention is now drawn to a third invasion, this time from the east, by nomadic races of Asia, — the Mongols and the Ottoman Turks.[1]

The ultimate results for European civilization of the Germanic invasion were, as we have seen, most salutary and happy, because of the fresh mental vigor, the firm moral qualities, and the political capacity of the invaders. The consequences, direct and indirect, of the Arabian invasion were mixed, and it would be difficult to make an appraisement of its net effects. The results of the Turanian irruption, on the other hand, were almost wholly disastrous, as we shall learn, to European civilization. The growth of the promising Russian nation was checked, and its social, moral, and political life sensibly impaired; while all the countries and races of Southeastern Europe were subjected for centuries to the degrading domination of a race alien in blood, in social institutions, in moral ideals, and in religious belief. Indeed, some

[1] The Mongols and Turks belong to that great family of predominantly nomadic or pastoral tribes and nations variously designated as the Scythic, *the Turanian, or* the Ural-Altaic, and having the steppes of Central and Northern *Asia as their chief* original seat.

of the European lands thus inundated have remained submerged beneath Asiatic barbarism up to the present day.

This comparatively late invasion of Europe by Asiatic nomads is noteworthy especially for the reason that it was the most successful of all the attacks during historic times of Asia upon Europe, and the last conquest of European territory by an Asiatic race. Ever since the force of this formidable assault was broken the European races have steadily encroached upon Asia, and it does not now look as though there would ever be another change in the tide that has so often flowed and ebbed.

The most serious of the inroads or threatened inroads into Europe by Turanian tribes to which our attention has already been drawn in the present survey were those of the Huns, the Avars, the Hungarians, and the Seljuk Turks. Of all these folks the Hungarians alone have a history which forms an integral part of the story of European civilization. In marked contrast to substantially all the other invading Turanians, they adopted the manners, the customs, and the religion of the European peoples, became in a word thoroughly Europeanized and Christianized, and for a long time were the chief bulwark of Christian Europe against the inundation of the Moslem Ottoman hordes. They are to-day, after the Germans, probably the race of most youthful energy and promise in Europe.

The Seljuk Turks were never able to set foot on European soil. It will be recalled that it was the capture of the holy places in Palestine by this intolerant race, and their menacing advance towards Constantinople, that alarmed Western Christendom and led to the First Crusade (par. 187). Dissensions among themselves and the blows dealt them by the crusaders brought their supremacy to an end.

242. The Conquests of the Mongols. — While the power of the Seljuk Turks was declining in Western Asia, the Mongols, cruel and untamed nomads bred on the steppes of Central

and Eastern Asia, that nursery of conquering races, were setting up a new dominion among the various tribes of Mongolia. Their first great chieftain was Temuchin, better known by the title he assumed of Jenghiz Khan, or "The Greatest Khan" (1206–1227), the most terrible scourge that ever afflicted the human race. At the head of innumerable hordes, composed largely of Turkish tribes, callous and pitiless in their slaughterings as though their victims belonged to another species than themselves, Jenghiz traversed with sword and torch a great part of Asia. Breaking through the Great Chinese Wall, built some fifteen centuries before as a defense against the ancestors of these same or kindred nomads, he conquered all the northern part of China, and then turning westward overran Turkestan and Persia. Cities disappeared as he advanced; populous plains were transformed into silent deserts. Before death overtook him he had extended his authority to the Dnieper in Russia and to the valley of the Indus. Even in death he claimed his victims: at his tomb forty maidens were slain that their spirits might go to serve him in the other world.

The vast domains of Jenghiz passed into the hands of his son Oghotai, or Oktai (d. 1241), a worthy successor of the great conqueror. He pushed outwards still further the boundaries of the empire in the east as well as in the west of Asia, and made a threatening invasion into Europe. This western expedition was led by the celebrated Batu, and was conducted, we are told by military experts, with "consummate strategy." A large part of Russia, Poland, and Hungary were overrun and devastated. The cities of Moscow, Kiev, Pesth, and many others were burned and their inhabitants slain. In the space of two or three terrible years (1238–1241) almost half of Europe was pitilessly ravaged. The inhabitants of the other half — such as were not insanely preoccupied with the quarrel between pope and emperor — seemed to be stunned. They made no concerted efforts to check the progress of the invaders. They apparently regarded the visitation

as though it were some destructive convulsion of nature for which there was no help or remedy. Fortunately, just at this critical moment Oktai died. Batu was recalled to Asia — and the civilization of Western Europe escaped the threatened destruction.

A successor of Oktai, Kublai Khan (1259–1294), still further enlarged the empire. One of his most important conquests was effected by his lieutenant Hulagu, who captured Bagdad (1277) and brought to an end the caliphate of the Abbassides (par. 92). Kublai's dominions finally came to embrace most of Asia together with Russia. Never before had so much of the earth been subject to a single will.

Kublai made Cambalu, the modern Peking, his royal seat, and there received ambassadors and visitors from all parts of the world. It was at the court of this prince that the celebrated Italian traveler Marco Polo resided many years and gained that valuable and quickening knowledge of the Far East which he communicated to Europe in his remarkable work of travels and observations.

Upon the death of Kublai Khan the immoderately extended and loosely knit empire fell into disorder and separated into many petty states. Its parts needed to be welded again by the genius of another chieftain. Timur, or Tamerlane (= *Timur-lenk*, "Timur the lame": 1369–1405), a remote relative of Jenghiz Khan, was the one chosen by destiny for the work of reëstablishing the Mongol dominion. He made Samarcand in Central Asia his capital and seems to have deliberately set about reducing the whole earth to obedience. He is said to have declared that "since God is one and hath no partner, therefore the vicegerent over the lands of the Lord must be one." If we may credit his *Memoirs*,[2] he conceived it to be his mission and duty wherever there was wrong to right it; wherever there was anarchy to establish order; and wherever there was oppression to deliver the oppressed.

[2] See "Sources" at end of chapter.

The anarchical condition of things in the various principalities of the former empire of Kublai Khan afforded him work enough to do. At the head of immense armies, composed of various tribes, he traversed anew a great part of the lands that had been tracked by the sanguinary marches of his Mongol predecessors. His trail was marked by bleaching bones and charred ruins. It was his custom to use the heads and bodies of his enemies as building material for the construction of great pyramids, the ghastly monuments of his revenge for resistance or rebellion.

But upon the ruins he had made, Timur erected a vast empire. A great part of Asia acknowledged his authority. Chieftains of remote regions are represented as giving him their allegiance in these words: "We have placed the collar of obedience on the neck of our life, and the saddle of servitude on our back." Over his wide dominions Timur ruled with a measure of moderation and equity which proves that he was something besides a mere ruthless conqueror and destroyer of men.

Timur's immense empire crumbled to pieces after his death. One of his descendants, Babar, or Baber, by name, invaded India (1525) and established there what became known as the Kingdom of the Great Moguls. This Mongol state lasted over two hundred years, — until destroyed by the English in the eighteenth century. The magnificence of the court of the Great Moguls at Delhi and Agra is one of the most splendid traditions of the East. These foreign rulers gave India some of her finest architectural monuments. The mausoleum at Agra, known as the *Taj Mahal*, is one of the most beautiful structures in the world.[3]

243. Historical Results of the Mongol Outbreak. — Asia has never recovered from the terrible devastation wrought by

[3] Wherever we find an upspringing of art and architecture under the Mongols we shall not be wrong in attributing it to the influence upon them of the civilizations with which they came in contact in China, Persia, India, and *Western Asia.* Their architects and artisans were generally furnished by the *conquered races* or by the cities of Western Europe.

the Mongol conquerors. Many districts swarming with life were swept clean of their population by these destroyers of the race and have remained to this day desolate as the tomb. Speaking of the once populous district lying southeastward of the Caspian, M. Rémusat affirms that five centuries have not sufficed to repair the ravages of four years.

But the consequences for Asia of the great upheaval were not wholly negative. One important positive result of these revolutions was the definitive establishment of the Lamaic hierarchy of Thibet. At the time of the Mongol conquests Buddhism had already established itself in that country. To the head of the Buddhistic priesthood there, the Mongol emperors came into some such relation as the Frankish kings entered into with the bishops of Rome (chap. vii). Kublai Khan elevated the living Buddha to royal rank and made him overlord of Thibet. Thus were established the rank and title of the Thibetan Grand Lama, and thus were laid the foundations of the temporal sovereignty of this remarkable Oriental papacy.[4]

A still more historically important outcome of the conquests and reign of Timur was the establishment of Mohammedanism as the predominant religion of Central Asia. Timur avowedly founded his empire on the morality and the religion of Islam. In his *Memoirs* we are told that he was inspired to wage war against idolaters by this verse of the Koran: "O Prophet, make war upon infidels and unbelievers and treat them with severity." Thus the wars which Timur waged were not mere wars of ambition; they were in the nature of crusades carried on for the purpose of spreading the religion of Islam.

But it is the relation of the Mongol eruption to the history of the West that chiefly concerns us at present. This revolution had significance for European history, as we have already intimated, almost solely on account of the Mongols having

[4] M. Abel-Rémusat, *Mélanges asiatiques*, tome i, sec. 8, pp. 129-145, "Discours sur l'origine de la Hiérarchie lamaïque."

laid the yoke of their power for a long time — for about three centuries — upon the Eastern Slavs. This was some such calamity for Russia as the later conquests of the Ottoman Turks were for the lands of Southeastern Europe. This Tartar domination, as we shall learn, left deep and permanent traces upon the Russian character and upon Russian history.

But there was some good issuing out of so much evil. As a consequence of the establishment of the extended empire of the Mongols there was better communication on the land side between Europe and Eastern Asia than had ever existed before or was destined to exist again until the construction in our own day of the Trans-Siberian Railroad. The way was long and wearisome but comparatively safe, and consequently it was traversed back and forth by embassies between the European courts and the Mongol potentates, and by missionary monks, artisans, merchants, and explorers. These missions and these expeditions of trade and adventure "prolonged, extended, and multiplied the relations which the Crusades had created between the East and the West."[5] Marco Polo is the type and symbol of it all (par. 228). Through this means there were brought into Europe from the Far East various arts, ideas, and inventions which undoubtedly contributed to the revival of culture in the West and to the inauguration of a new age for the European peoples.

M. Rémusat ventures the opinion that the progress of Western civilization would have been delayed several centuries had the European peoples been left to develop without aid all the arts and industrial processes which they received from the East during the sixty years of Mongol ascendency. "Thus," to use the words of this eminent scholar, "the ambition of the conqueror serves, although independently of his will, to awaken new life in the lands to which he has not

[5] *M. Abel-Rémusat, Mélanges asiatiques*, tome i, sec. 24, "Sur les relations *politiques* des Rois de France avec les Empereurs mongols."

been able to extend his ravages, and thus we see civilization aided in its progress by the very scourges which seemed destined to annihilate it."

II. The Ottoman Turks.

244. The Beginnings of the Ottoman Empire. — The latest, most permanent, and most important historically of all the Turanian sovereignties was that established by the Ottoman Turks. The first appearance of this folk upon the arena of history was dramatic, and prophetic of their conquering career. About the middle of the thirteenth century a chieftain, accompanied by a band of several hundred horsemen, was riding over the hills of Anatolia in the neighborhood of Angora. Unexpectedly the wanderers came upon a battle in full progress — battles were to be found almost anywhere in those days in those parts. The cavaliers, through sheer love of a fight, for they were totally ignorant alike of who the combatants were and why they thus fought together, dashed into the thickest of the battle, chivalrously taking the part of the weaker and yielding side, and quickly turning the fight in its favor. It developed that the "beneficiaries of their chivalrous act" were Seljuk Turks forming the army of the sultan of Iconium. The grateful sultan invited the strangers to abide among his people and offered them lands for their flocks. They accepted the invitation, and the settlement thus formed became the nucleus of the great Ottoman Empire.[6]

The name of the hero of this story was Ertogrul. The empire, the germ of which he planted, bears however not his name but that of his son Othman,[7] for the reason that he was the first to assume in the new land the rank and bearing of an independent ruler.

[6] Creasy, *History of the Ottoman Turks*, chap. i.

[7] Othman I (1288–1326), or Osman, whence not only "Ottoman," but "Osmanlis," the favorite name which the Turks apply to themselves.

Gradually the Ottoman princes subjected to their rule the various surrounding tribes which the Mongolian conquests had crowded westward into Asia Minor, and at the same time seized upon province after province of the Asiatic possessions of the Byzantine emperors. During the reign of Murad, or Amurath, I (1360–1389) a large part of the regions that came to be known as Turkey in Europe fell into their hands.

245. The Janizaries. — The conquests of the Turks were greatly aided by a remarkably efficient body of soldiers known as the Janizaries, which was organized early in the fourteenth century. This select corps was composed at first of the fairest children of Christian captives. When war ceased to furnish recruits, the sultans levied a tribute of children on their Christian subjects. At one time this tribute amounted to two thousand boys yearly. This method of recruiting the corps was maintained for about three hundred years. The boys, who were generally received at the age of about eight, were brought up in the Mohammedan faith and carefully trained in military service. These "infant proselytes of war" formed a military body that was one of the chief instruments in the creation of the Ottoman Empire.

246. Christian and Turk; Turk and Mongol. — Murad I was followed by Bayezid, or Bajazet, I (1347–1403), the rapid advance of whose conquests spread the greatest alarm throughout Central and Western Europe. The old crusading spirit was again awakened. The warriors of Hungary, Poland, and France collected to arrest the menacing progress of the barbarians; but the allied army, numbering a hundred thousand men, was cut to pieces by the sabers of the Turks on the fatal field of Nicopolis, in Bulgaria (1396). Thousands of the knights and common soldiers who were made prisoners were barbarously and deliberately massacred by their captors.

The unfortunate issue of this terrible battle threw all the West into a perfect panic of terror. Bayezid vowed that his horse "should eat oats on the high altar of Saint Peter's in

Rome," and there seemed no power in Christendom to prevent the sacrilege.

Before proceeding to fulfill his threat, Bayezid turned back to capture Constantinople, which he believed in the present despondent state of its inhabitants would make little or no resistance. The city was invested by the Turkish hosts, and the fate of the capital appeared to be sealed. In vain did the Greeks call upon the Latin warriors for aid; Christendom was weak from the losses at Nicopolis, and besides was paralyzed with fear. But though no succor came from the Christian West, aid did come, strangely enough, from the Mohammedan East.

Just at this time Tamerlane was leading his hordes on their career of conquest. He directed them against the Turks in Asia Minor, and Bayezid was forced to raise the siege of Constantinople and hasten across the Bosporus to check the advance in his dominions of these new enemies. The Turks and Mongols met upon the plains of Angora, where the former suffered a disastrous defeat (1402). Bayezid himself was taken prisoner and died soon after in captivity.

This disastrous defeat at Angora checked for a time the conquests of the Ottomans and saved Constantinople to the Christian world for another period of fifty years.

247. The Fall of Constantinople (1453). — The Ottomans, however, gradually recovered from the blow given them by the Mongols. By the year 1421 they were strong enough to make another attempt upon Constantinople. The city was this time saved by the strength of its defenses. Another quarter of a century passed. Then finally, in the year 1453, Mohammed II the Great (1451–1480) laid siege to the capital with a vast army and fleet. The walls of the city were manned by a mere handful of men. After a short investment the place was taken by storm. The heroic emperor, Constantine Palæologus, refusing to live "an Emperor without an Empire," fell sword in hand. Of the hundred thousand inhabitants of the capital forty thousand are said to have been

slain and fifty thousand made slaves. The Cross, which since the time of Constantine the Great had surmounted the dome of Saint Sophia, was replaced by the Crescent.

Thus fell New Rome into the hands of the barbarians of the East almost an exact millennium after Old Rome had passed into the possession of the barbarians of the West. Its fall was one of the most harrowing and fate-laden events in history. As Mohammed, like Scipio at Carthage, gazed upon the ruined city and the empty palace of Constantine, he is

THE EMPIRE OF THE OTTOMAN TURKS ABOUT 1464

said, impressed by the mutability of fortune, to have repeated musingly the lines of the Persian poet Firdusi: "The spider's web is the curtain in Cæsar's palace; the owl is the sentinel on the watch-tower of Afrasiab."[8]

248. The Ottomans checked by the Hungarians and the Knights of Rhodes. — The consternation which the fall of New Rome created throughout Christendom was like the

[8] *Afrasiab is the name of a personage who figures in the historical legends of Persia.*

dismay which filled the world upon the downfall of Old Rome in the fifth century. All Europe now lay open to the Moslem barbarians, and there seemed nothing to prevent their placing the Crescent upon the dome of Saint Peter's.

Various efforts were made through councils and diets to effect a union among the different Christian powers for the recovery of Constantinople and the expulsion of the Turks from Europe. But times had changed since Peter the Hermit and Saint Bernard preached the Crusades for the recovery of the holy places of Palestine, and the West could not be roused for a united effort against the infidel intruders. So long as the crown of a prince was not in immediate danger, he cared but little whether Christian Greeks or Mohammedan Turks knelt in Saint Sophia. Moreover, the disastrous effects upon faith of the Great Schism in the papacy were yet felt, and the voice of the pope had lost its earlier power as well of persuasion as of command.

But though no plan for united action could be concerted among the Christian states, the warriors of Hungary made a valiant stand against the Ottomans and succeeded in checking their advance upon the Continent, while the Knights of Saint John, now established in the island of Rhodes, held them in restraint in the Mediterranean. Mohammed II did succeed, however, in planting the Crescent upon the shores of Italy — capturing and holding for a year the city of Otranto in Calabria (1480). Before the end of the sixteenth century the conquering energy of the Ottomans had spent itself, and their empire had attained its greatest extent.

The Turks have ever remained quite insensible to the influences of European civilization, and their rule, since the loss of the energy and capacity which characterized the earlier sultans, has been a perfect blight and curse to the Christian races subjected to their authority. They have always been looked upon as intruders in Europe, and their presence there has led to several of the most sanguinary wars of modern

times. Gradually they are being pushed out from their European possessions, and the time is probably not remote when they will be driven back across the Bosporus, just as the Moslem Moors were expelled long ago from the opposite corner of the Continent by the Christian chivalry of Spain.

Sources and Source Material. — *The Life of Jenghis Khan* (trans. from the Chinese by Robert K. Douglas: London, 1877). We have here from Chinese records three narratives, dealing chiefly with Jenghiz's conquests in China, woven into a single account. *The Journey of William of Rubruck to the Eastern Parts of the World, 1253–55* (trans. by William W. Rockhill; printed for the Hakluyt Society: London, 1900). William of Rubruck, or Rubruquis as he is more commonly designated, was a Franciscan friar sent by Saint Louis of France on a secret embassy to the camp of the Mongol emperor Mangu Khan at Caracarum in Mongolia. For the internal history of the Mongol empire his remarkable narrative is next in importance to that of Marco Polo. *The Book of Ser Marco Polo* (see p. 255). Marco Polo resided seventeen years at the court of Kublai Khan at Cambulu, the modern Peking. He saw the Mongol court at the time of its greatest brilliancy and gave Europe a vivid description of what he observed and heard in an account which our growing knowledge of the Farther East is giving a constantly higher reputation for accuracy and honesty. *Narrative of the Embassy of Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo to the Court of Timour at Samarcand, A.D. 1403-6* (trans. by Clements R. Markham; issued by the Hakluyt Society: London, 1859). The author of this valuable record was sent on his mission by Henry III, king of Castile and Leon. *Institutes, Political and Military, written originally in the Mogul Language by the Great Timour* (trans. into English from a Persian version by Major Davy: London, 1783). The genuineness of this work is called in question by many Oriental scholars. It is, however, a remarkable book and should not be overlooked by the student. The purpose of the *Institutes* is thus stated by the (alleged) imperial author: "Having established laws and regulations for the well-governing of my dominions, I have collected these regulations and laws as a model for others." Respecting his government Timur says: "I carried on the business of my empire by generosity, and by patience, and by policy; and I acted with courteousness towards my friends and towards my enemies." Viewed merely as an ideal, considering the environment out of which it arose, this is remarkable. *The Mulfuzāt Timūry, or Autobiographical Memoirs of the Moghul Emperor Timur* (trans. from a Persian version

by Major Charles Stewart: London, 1830). The authenticity of this work is also doubtful. Extracts from it, bearing on Indian history, are to be found in Elliott's *History of India as told by its own Historians*, vol. iii, pp. 389–477. *Cathay and the way thither* (Hakluyt Society publications), 2 vols., contains, along with much other matter, several mediæval accounts of the Mongols' relations with China, translated by Henry Yule.

Secondary or Modern Works. — HOWORTH (H. H.), ***History of the Mongols from the Ninth to the Nineteenth Century*, 4 vols. The best and most comprehensive work on the subject. CREASY (E. S.), **History of the Ottoman Turks* (various editions), chaps. i–vi. FINLAY (G.), *History of Greece* (ed. by Tozer), vol. iii, bk. iv, chap. ii. GIBBON (E.), *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chaps. lxiv–lxviii. MIJATOVICH (C.), ***Constantine, the Last Emperor of the Greeks; or the Conquest of Constantinople by the Turks (A.D. 1453)*. The best account in English of its subject. POOLE (S. L.), *The Story of Turkey* (Story of the Nations), chaps. i–vii. OMAN (C.), *The Story of the Byzantine Empire* (Story of the Nations), chaps. xxv and xxvi. On the rise of the Ottoman Turks and the Fall of Constantinople. FREEMAN (E. A.), *The Ottoman Power in Europe*, chaps. i–iv.

CHAPTER XVI

THE GROWTH OF THE TOWNS

249. The Barbarians and the Roman Cities. — The old Roman towns, as points of attack and defense, suffered much during the period of the barbarian invasions. When the storm had passed many of the once strong-walled towns lay "rings of ruins" on the wasted plains. Rome itself, as we have seen, was for a time without a living soul within its walls (par. 62). In Britain a considerable part of the Roman towns seem to have been virtually wiped out of existence by the Anglo-Saxon invaders. In Southern France, in Italy, and in Spain the cities on the whole suffered less; yet in none of the countries where they had sprung up and flourished under the shelter of the Roman rule did they wholly escape hurt and harm.

But it was not alone the violence of the destroyers of the empire that brought so many cities to ruin. What chiefly caused their depopulation and decay was the preference of the barbarians for the open country to the city. As we have already learned, they had no liking for life within city walls. Hence it was inevitable that under the influence of the invasion, city life, speaking generally, should give place to country life. Up to the eleventh century the population of Europe was essentially a rural population like that of Russia to-day. Feudalism, which had its first development during this period, was an economic and social system characteristic of a rural and not of an urban society.

250. Revival of the Old Towns and Founding of New Ones. — *But just* as soon as the invaders had settled down and

civilization had begun to revive, the old Roman towns began gradually to assume somewhat of their former importance, and new ones to spring up in those provinces where they had been swept away, and in the countries outside of the limits of the ancient empire.

The location of the new towns was determined by different circumstances. The necessities of trade and commerce pointed out the sites of many of them, and formed the basis of their growth and prosperity. Favorable locations on the sea-coasts, upon the great rivers, or along the overland routes of travel, as, for instance, that between Venice and the Netherlands, were naturally chosen as stations for exchanging, distributing, and forwarding the wares and products of the times. On such spots grew up rich and populous cities. Many, particularly in Germany, sprang up around castles, frontier fortresses, and military strongholds, as their present names (Marienburg, Königsberg, etc.) indicate. Still others had for their starting-point monasteries or shrines. All the forces of an age of expansion and progress were once more calling into existence cities and towns, the growth and the decay of which may perhaps be taken as the best register of the growth and the decay of civilization.

251. Rapid Development of the Cities in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries. — During the tenth century Western Europe, it will be recalled, was terribly troubled by the Northmen, the Hungarians, and the Saracens (par. 150). There being no strong central government, the cities, thrown upon their own resources for defense, sometimes with and sometimes without royal or imperial sanction, armed their militia, perfected their municipal organization, and above all else surrounded themselves with walls. Strong walls were the only sure protection in those evil times. Thus Europe became thickset with strong-walled cities, the counterpart of the castles of the feudal lords, which were the defense of the country-side.

252. The Towns enter the Feudal System; their Revolt. — When feudalism took possession of Europe, the cities became a part of the system. They became vassals and suzerains. As vassals, they were of course subjected to all the incidents of feudal ownership.[1] They owed allegiance to their suzerain, were he baron, prince, prelate, king, or emperor, and must pay him feudal tribute and aid him in his war enterprises.

As the cities, through their manufactures and trade, were the most wealthy members of the feudal system, the lords naturally looked to them for money when in need. Their demands and exactions at last became unendurable, and a long struggle broke out between them and the burghers, which resulted in what is known as the enfranchisement of the towns.

It was in the eleventh century that this revolt of the cities against the feudal lords became general. The burghers by this time had made their walls strong, and had learned to fight — if indeed they had ever forgotten that art. They became bold enough to defy their lord — to shut their gates in the face of his tax-gatherer, and even in the face of the lord himself, even though he were king or emperor, when he came to parley with them. The contest lasted two centuries and more.

The advantage in the end rested with the burghers. In process of time the greater number of the towns of the countries of Western Europe either bought with money, which was the usual mode of enfranchisement of English and German cities, or wrested by force of arms charters from their lords or suzerains. Many lords, however, of their own free will gave charters to the towns within their fiefs, granting them various exemptions and privileges, for the reason that this fostered

[1] At first each householder in a town was a tenant of the lord of the fief, and was individually liable to him for rents or military service, but later many of the towns as towns, that is, as corporate bodies, became responsible for the rents and services due the lord. It was not until the towns came to act in their *corporate capacity* that they became an important factor in the political system.

their growth and prosperity and made them more profitable vassals and tenants. Similar motives led many lords to establish new towns, and to draw settlers to them by conferring upon the places market privileges and various immunities, including certain rights of local self-government.

253. The Status of the Chartered Towns. — In many cases the charters simply defined the ancient customs and privileges of the favored towns and guaranteed them against unreasonable and arbitrary demands on the part of their lord. Even this, however, was a great gain; and as, under the protection of their charters, the cities grew in wealth and population, many of them in some countries became at last strong enough to cast off all actual dependence upon lord, or suzerain, became in effect independent states — little commonwealths. Especially was this true in the case of the Italian cities, and in a less marked degree in the case of some of the German towns. Respecting the fortunes of the cities in these two countries, we shall speak with some detail in later paragraphs.

In other countries, however, particularly in France, the towns retained only for a short time the partial freedom they had won. In that country by the end of the Middle Ages their franchises and their privileges of self-government had been in a great measure taken from them and they had become subject to the will of the king, and their affairs were in general under the superintendence of officers appointed by the crown.

254. The Industrial Life of the Towns; the Gilds. — The towns were the workshops of the later Middle Ages. The most noteworthy characteristics of their industrial life are connected with certain corporations or fraternities known as gilds. There were two chief classes of these, the gild merchant and the craft gilds. The gild merchant appears in the towns as soon as their commercial life becomes in any way active, that is to say, about the eleventh century. The members of the fraternity, speaking generally, were the chief landowners and traders of the place.

The primary object of the association was the promotion of the business interests of its members, but it had, like all other gilds, a social, a religious, and a political side. Indeed, it was its political activity that gave it a large part of its historical importance. In many towns it formed practically what might be called the industrial and trade department of the city government; in some places, particularly in England, the entire management of municipal affairs was for a time virtually in the hands of its members.

Later, as trade developed, the craftsmen, who in many cases at least had been admitted to membership in the gild merchant, began to form separate fellowships on the model of the earlier society. Gilds of this kind appear both in the English towns and in those on the Continent during the course of the twelfth century. We hear of unions of the shoemakers, the bakers, the weavers, the spinners, the dyers, the millers, and so on to the end. In some cities there were upwards of fifty of these associations.

No sooner had these plebeian societies grown strong than, in many of the Continental cities, they entered into a bitter struggle with the patrician gild merchant for a share in the municipal government or for participation in its trade monopoly. This conflict, in some of its features, reminds us of that between patrician and plebeian in ancient Rome. It lasted for two centuries and more, — the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries mark the height of the struggle on the Continent, — and during all this time filled the towns with strenuous confusion. The outcome, speaking in general terms, was the triumph of the craftsmen. The gild merchant was reduced to a subordinate position in the town government or was absorbed by the craft gilds.

The internal history of the towns during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is very largely the story of the gilds in their manifold activities. This story, however, it is impossible to give even in outline in our short space. We

must content ourselves with having merely indicated the place of these interesting fraternities in the life of the mediæval towns.

255. The Hanseatic League. — When, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the towns of Northern Europe began to extend their commercial connections, the greatest drawback to their trade was the general insecurity and disorder that everywhere prevailed. The trader who intrusted his goods designed for the Italian market to the overland routes was in danger of losing them at the hands of the robber nobles, who watched all the lines of travel, and either robbed the merchant outright or levied an iniquitous toll upon his goods. The plebeian tradesman, in the eyes of these thieving barons, had no rights which they were bound to respect. Nor was the way to Italy by the Baltic and the North Sea beset with less peril. Piratical crafts scoured those waters and made booty of any luckless merchantman they might overpower or lure to wreck upon the dangerous shores.

Finally, about the middle of the thirteenth century, some of the German cities, among which Lübeck and Hamburg were prominent, began to form temporary alliances for protecting their merchants against pirates and robbers. These transient leagues finally led to the formation of the celebrated Hanseatic[2] League, whose firm organization as a political power dates from near the middle of the fourteenth century. The confederation came to embrace eighty or more — the number is uncertain — of the principal towns of North Germany.

The league organized armies, equipped navies, and exercised all the powers of sovereignty. It was "mediæval Germany on the sea." It carried on successful war against the kings of Denmark, and with the threat of war forced from Edward IV of England important concessions in favor of its merchants.

[2] From the old German *hansa*, a "confederation," or "union."

In order to facilitate the trading operations of its members, the league maintained in different foreign cities factories, magazines, inns, and chapels, which were in charge of persons vowed like monks to lives of celibacy. These stations were somewhat like the settlements established to-day by Europeans in the countries of the Far East. The most noted centers of the foreign trade of the confederation were the cities of Bruges, London, Bergen, Wisby, and Novgorod. The Flemish city Bruges was the great intermediate station between Italy and

THE HANSA TOWNS AND THEIR CHIEF FOREIGN SETTLEMENTS

the north of Europe. The establishment of the league at London controlled a considerable share of the traffic of the British Isles, much to the detriment finally of the English merchants. Bergen was the center of the trade with Norway and Iceland; Wisby, of that with Sweden and Finland; while at Novgorod, in Russia, were gathered for distribution throughout the West the products of Russia and the countries beyond. The league thus became a vast monopoly, which endeavored to control in the interests of its own members the entire commerce of Northern Europe.

256. Causes of the Dissolution of the League. — Numerous causes concurred to undermine the prosperity of the Hansa towns and to bring about the dissolution of the league. Most prominent among these was the development of the manufactures and trade of the peoples whom the German merchants had for a time commercially subjected. The native traders now naturally became jealous of these foreigners, and the sovereigns of the land in which they had been allowed to establish settlements found it to their interest to annul the privileges formerly granted them and to encourage home industry and trade.

Another circumstance which caused the decline of the influence of the league was the general advance in civilization of the European peoples and the growth of strong national governments able to repress brigandage on the land and piracy on the sea, and to maintain armies and war navies superior to those of the league.

Among other agencies of disruption may be mentioned the revolution in the herring fisheries, an important industry of the North German cities. In the earlier days of the league the fish on which this industry depended frequented the waters of the Baltic controlled by the Hansa towns, but in the fifteenth century they deserted these haunts for the waters off the Netherlands. In this way a lucrative industry of the German cities was virtually taken from them and thrown into the hands of their rivals.

Coincident with this revolution in the herring fisheries came the great maritime discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which transferred the centers of commercial activity as well from the Baltic as from the Mediterranean ports to the harbors on the Atlantic seaboard. Finally, the Reformation and the accompanying religious wars in Germany, which brought many of the Hansa towns to utter ruin, completed the dissolution of the league.

257. Causes of the Early Growth of the Italian Cities. — But it was in Italy that the mediæval municipalities had their

most remarkable development and acquired the greatest power and influence. A variety of circumstances and causes concurred in promoting their early and rapid growth.

First, these cities were the heirs of the great Roman past in a truer sense than were any of the towns outside of Italy. If in most of them no part of the actual machinery of the ancient municipal government was any longer in existence, still the inspiring memories and traditions of old-time liberties had not yet been forgotten, nor were destined ever to be forgotten.

Second, their political development was favored by the destruction of the unity of the peninsula by the Lombards. There being no strong central authority, the cities came naturally to assume large governmental responsibilities and to stand to one another in the relation of independent states.

Third, the weak development of feudalism in the peninsula, as a consequence of the comparatively small number of the barbarian intruders, favored the development of the municipalities. In the struggle here between the cities and the feudal lords the cities triumphed. Instead of being brought in vassalage to the barons, as happened almost everywhere else, the cities brought them into subjection. The lords, either through choice or by compulsion, became citizens of the towns. This absorption of the feudal nobility into the citizenship of the towns greatly strengthened them and contributed largely to the development of that diversity of life and that extraordinary energy of character which distinguished the inhabitants of these city-republics.

Fourth, the long struggle between the papacy and the empire tended greatly to enhance the liberties of the Italian cities. The pope and emperor were constantly bidding against each other for the help of the cities, — a situation which they took advantage of to make themselves practically independent of all superior control.

But the main direct cause of the material prosperity and *indirectly of the* political power of the most important of the

Italian coast cities was their trade with the East, and the enormous impulse it received from the Crusades. Venice, Genoa, and Pisa became immensely rich through the vast transport business thrown into the hands of their merchants by the crusading movement. And after the Crusades had ceased, the trade to which they had given birth still continued. The returning crusaders, bringing back with them a taste for Oriental customs and notions, created a great demand for articles of refinement and luxury, which could be supplied only by the Italian traders through their Eastern connections.

The political history of these Italian cities is very intricate and uninteresting; but their social, artistic, and commercial records form the most brilliant pages of the annals of the Middle Ages. There are, however, three important matters which may be considered as belonging to their general political history: (1) the formation of the Lombard League, (2) the dissensions of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and (3) the rise of despots in the cities. We shall speak of each of these matters under a separate head, and then shall proceed to notice some of the more interesting and instructive circumstances in the separate commercial or intellectual life of the representative states of Venice, Genoa, and Florence.

258. The Lombard League. — As we have previously noticed, a great crisis in the history of the Italian cities was reached when Frederick Barbarossa became emperor (par. 230). Frederick held very lofty views of the empire and its providential place in the government of the world, so that not merely a very natural ambition but conceptions of duty caused him to uphold unyieldingly the imperial prerogatives. He was influenced doubtless by the civil lawyers who just now were engaging with great enthusiasm in the study of the old Roman law. Now this law had made the authority of the emperor over the cities of the empire virtually absolute. It was very natural then that Frederick, under the influence of the jurists, should have persuaded himself that the Italian

cities had been making encroachments upon the imperial authority, and that it would be right for him to resume the power which his immediate predecessors had allowed to slip out of their hands. He would rule as had Justinian, Charles the Great, and Otto I.

With Frederick entertaining such conceptions of the imperial prerogatives, a struggle between him and the Italian cities was inevitable. To them, his claims meant tyranny; to him, theirs meant license and anarchy. Consequently, when Frederick attempted to place his own judges in the towns, to take away from them the right of waging private war, and to place other restrictions upon them, there came an armed conflict, which lasted for thirty years. We may say of this war between the emperor and his city vassals, as has been said of our late Civil War, that it was fought to get a definition of a constitution — the unwritten constitution of the Holy Roman Empire.

Frederick repeatedly descended into Italy with an army to enforce his authority. He captured and burned several of the cities of Lombardy. At last the powerful city of Milan, which had heroically withstood his arms, fell into his hands. He scattered its inhabitants in villages, after the old Greek fashion of destroying a city, and razed to the ground its walls and buildings (1162).

A confederation known as the Lombard League was now formed by the exiled Milanese and a large number of the cities of Northern Italy, for the purpose of avenging the wrongs of Milan and resisting the emperor's pretensions. The banded cities stood firm for their cherished liberties. Finally, on the field of Legnano, in 1176, as we have already related, the Milanese and their allies, rallying around the sacred *carroccio*,[3] inflicted upon the imperial army an overwhelming defeat.

[3] In the eleventh century Heribert, archbishop of Milan, invented for that *city an ensign* consisting of a pole bearing the crucifix and raised on a chariot — *hence called the carroccio.* The car was drawn by four yokes of oxen and was,

The battle of Legnano is noted in the annals of liberty. "It was one of those few fields," writes the historian Gallenga, "in which human blood flowed sacred and holy." A truce of six years was the prelude to the Peace of Constance (1183). By this agreement the emperor's authority over the cities was reduced virtually to a titular and idle suzerainty,[4] while their right to manage their own internal affairs and to wage private war was acknowledged.

259. Dissensions among the Italian Cities; the Age of Liberty. — The cities had preserved or rather recovered their liberties. They had secured at Constance confirmation particularly of the cherished right of private war. This was a fatal privilege. They misused it, and brought upon themselves no end of trouble and suffering. For a century and more they waged ever-renewed, bitter, and sanguinary wars upon one another.

The causes of dissension were many and near at hand. "The cities fought," says Symonds, "for command of seaports, passes, rivers, roads, and all the avenues of wealth and plenty." But besides the numerous causes of strife between the different republics, there were elements of discord within the walls of each individual city. The struggle between the papacy and the empire, in which the Italians perforce took part, divided the population of each town into two parties, — the Ghibellines, who adhered to the emperor, and the Guelphs,[5]

like the ancient Ark of the Israelites, of which it was a sort of imitation, the rallying point of the army on the battlefield. Many of the other cities followed the example of Milan, and under these curious standards, "the sign and symbol of all they held dear," the Italian cities marched in their short but brilliant career of freedom.

[4] The emperor retained the right to place representatives in the cities and to receive food, forage, and lodging for his army when he might chance to visit Italy.

[5] These names, which were of German origin, became at last mere party shibboleths. Speaking in a very general way, it may be said that the Ghibellines represented the intrusive Teutonic element and favored a feudal, aristocratic organization of society, while the Guelphs represented the old Roman population and were supporters of liberal democratic institutions.

who espoused the cause of his enemy the pope. The history of civil dissensions might be searched in vain for a parallel to the bitterness and vindictiveness with which the struggle between these parties was carried on for centuries.

Still another very fruitful source of disorder and violence in the cities was the presence there of the feudal lords. In other lands these quarrelsome folk fought out their feuds in the open country; in Italy, in the streets of the cities.

Nevertheless, though fraught with so many evils, "Liberty," as declares Herodotus in speaking of Athens and the achievements of her free citizens, "Liberty is a brave thing." The strenuous freedom of the Italian cities fostered great talents and virtues in their citizens. Guicciardini attributes the prosperity, splendor, and brilliant culture of the Italian cities during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to the local independence they then enjoyed.

260. The Rise of Despots. — The constant wars of the Italian cities with each other and the incessant strife of parties within each community led to the same issue as that to which tended the endless contentions and divisions of the Greek cities in ancient times. Their democratic institutions were overthrown, internecine war and strife having resulted in anarchy, and anarchy having led, as always, to tyranny.

By the end of the thirteenth century almost all the republics of Northern and Central Italy down to the papal states, save Venice, Genoa, and the cities of Tuscany, had fallen into the hands of domestic tyrants, many of whom by their crimes and their intolerable tyranny rendered themselves as odious as the worst of the tyrants who usurped supreme power in the free cities of ancient Hellas. They possessed, many of them, a remarkable "energy for crime." Their strenuous wickedness filled the land with violence and terror.

One thing which enabled these usurpers to seize the supreme power in the cities was the decay of the military spirit in their inhabitants. The burghers became immersed in business and

delegated the defense of their cities to mercenaries. The captains of these hirelings were known as *condottieri*. Some of them were foreign adventurers; all were soldiers of fortune. They found it easy to overthrow the liberties of the cities which they had been hired to defend. Machiavelli declares that "the ruin of Italy proceeded from no other cause than that for years together it reposed itself upon mercenary arms."

We shall now relate some circumstances, for the most part of a commercial or social character, which concern some of the most renowned of the Italian city-states.

261. Venice. —Venice, the most famous of the Italian cities, had its beginnings in the fifth century in the rude huts of some refugees who fled out into the marshes of the Adriatic to escape the fury of the Huns of Attila. Here, secure from the pursuit of the barbarians, who were unprovided with boats, they gradually built up, on some low islets, a number of little villages, which finally, towards the close of the seventh century, coalesced to form a single city, at whose head was placed a ruler bearing the title of Duke, or Doge, a name destined to acquire a wide renown.

Throughout the ninth and tenth centuries the galleys of the little republic were defending her commerce in the Adriatic against the Norman and Saracen corsairs, or repulsing formidable attacks upon her island home by the barbarian Slavonians and Hungarians. For the sake of protection, some Greek cities upon the opposite shore of the Adriatic put themselves under her government. Conquests and negotiations gradually extended her possessions century after century, until she finally came to control the coast and waters of the Eastern Mediterranean in much the same way that Carthage had mastery of the Western Mediterranean at the time of the First Punic War.

Even before the Crusades her trade with the East was very extensive, and by those expeditions was expanded into enormous dimensions. The sea between Italy and the ports of

Egypt and Syria was whitened with the sails of her transports and war-galleys. It will be recalled that she took part in the Fourth Crusade, which resulted in the capture of Constantinople by the Latin Christians, and that she received, as her share of the divided lands of the Eastern emperor, the Peloponnesus and most of the Greek islands and shore lands, — a goodly empire of the sea.

One of the most important matters connected with the internal history of Venice is what is known as the closing of the Great Council just at the end of the thirteenth century. At this time the affairs of the republic were practically in the hands of this body, which was a legislative and executive assembly consisting of members representing the different wards of the city. It was an elective body and was renewed each year. Every citizen, whether plebeian or patrician, was eligible to membership. Between the years 1297 and 1317 by a series of resolutions and decrees this assembly consummated a measure whereby the privilege of sitting in the council was confined to the families then represented in it. By this proceeding the hitherto at least nominally democratic government of Venice was changed into an exclusive oligarchy, which character it maintained until the fall of the Venetian state five hundred years later.

At the same time that the Great Council was thus closed against the commoners, there was created (in 1311) the so-called Council of Ten. This was a sort of Committee of Public Safety, with very large powers of arrest and imprisonment. One of its duties was to safeguard the republic against conspiracies. A certain mystery and secrecy enveloped its acts, many of which were cruel and arbitrary, so that its name has, though perhaps with some degree of injustice, come to be associated with that of the decemvirs at Rome and that of the dread Committee of Public Safety of the French Revolution.

Venice was at the height of her power during the thirteenth, *fourteenth,* and fifteenth centuries. Her supremacy on the

Mediterranean Sea, which was as complete as is England's on the ocean to-day, was celebrated each year by the unique ceremony of "Wedding the Adriatic" by the dropping of a ring into the sea. The origin of this custom was as follows. In the year 1177 Pope Alexander III, out of gratitude to the Venetians for services rendered him in his quarrel with the emperor Frederick Barbarossa, gave a ring to the Doge with these words: "Take this as a token of dominion over the sea, and wed her every year, you and your successors forever, in order that all may know that the sea belongs to Venice, and is subject to her as a bride is subject to her husband." The annual celebration of this ceremony was one of the most brilliant spectacles of the Middle Ages.

The maritime power and ascendency of Venice was embodied in her famous Arsenal. This consisted of a series of wharves, dockyards, and vast magazines filled with marine war-engines and military stores of every kind. In the city's palmiest day sixteen thousand shipbuilders, workmen, and guards were employed here. The capacity of the shipbuilding yards is shown by the story that upon the occasion of a visit by the king of France a galley was constructed, equipped, and launched in two hours. The Arsenal, as the above tale illustrates, was one of the sights of Europe and is still an object of interest to the curious traveler. Dante introduced in his *Inferno*[6] a celebrated description of the place, doubtless from personal knowledge of it.

The decline of Venice dates from the fifteenth century. The conquests of the Ottoman Turks during this century deprived her of much of the territory she held east of the Adriatic, and finally the discovery of the New World by Columbus and of an unbroken water route to India by Vasco da Gama gave a death-blow to her commerce. From this time on the trade with the East was to be conducted from the Atlantic ports instead of from those in the Mediterranean.

[6] Canto xxi, 7–19.

262. Genoa. — Genoa, on the old Ligurian coast, was after Venice the most powerful of the Italian maritime cities. She early crushed her near competitor Pisa,[7] and then entered into a fierce competition with Venice for the control of the trade of the Orient.

Like Venice, Genoa reaped a rich harvest during the Crusades. The period of her greatest prosperity dates from the recapture of Constantinople from the Latins by the Greeks in 1261. Through jealousy of the Venetians, the Genoese assisted the Greeks in the recovery of Constantinople and in return were given various commercial privileges in places along the Bosporus. Very soon they established stations upon the shores of the Euxine, and began to carry on a lucrative trade with Eastern Asia by way of the Black Sea and the Caspian.

The jealousy with which the Venetians regarded the prosperity of the Genoese led to oft-renewed war between the two rival republics. For nearly two centuries their hostile fleets contended, as did the navies of Rome and Carthage, for the supremacy of the sea. In the year 1380 Venice inflicted upon her rival a terrible naval defeat which crippled her permanently.

The final blow to her prosperity, however, was given by the irruption into Europe of the Mongols and the Ottoman Turks, and the capture of Constantinople by the latter in 1453. The Genoese traders were now driven from the Black Sea, and their traffic with Eastern Asia was completely broken up; for the Venetians had control of the ports of Egypt and Syria and the southern routes to India and the countries beyond — that is, the routes by way of the Euphrates and the Red Sea.

[7] Pisa is located a little to the south of Genoa, on the same coast. The first battle between the navies of the two republics was fought in 1070. Thenceforward for two centuries the rival cities were engaged in an almost continuous war, which finally resulted in the complete destruction of the power of Pisa. Like Genoa, Pisa contains at the present time many architectural monuments, among them the famous Leaning Tower, dating from the period of her commercial prosperity.

Genoa still contains many architectural monuments, especially superb palaces, which bear abundant evidence of the genius of her artists and the wealth and munificence of her merchant princes during that splendid period when the renown of the city-republic was spread throughout the world.

263. Florence. — Florence, "the most illustrious and fortunate of Italian Republics," although from her inland location upon the Arno shut out from engaging in those naval enterprises that conferred wealth and importance upon the coast cities of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa, became, notwithstanding, through the skill, industry, enterprise, and genius of her citizens, the great manufacturing, financial, literary, and art center of the later mediæval centuries.

The woolen and silk products of her looms and the fine work of her jewelers were famous in all the markets of the world. Through her banking institutions she became the money center of Europe. The list of her illustrious citizens, of her poets, statesmen, historians, architects, sculptors, and painters, is more extended than that of any other city of mediæval times; and indeed, as respects the number of her great men, Florence is perhaps unrivaled by any city of the ancient or modern world save Athens. In her long roll of fame we find the names of Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Machiavelli, Michael Angelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Galileo, Amerigo Vespucci, and the Medici.

In no other of the Italian cities were the contentions between Guelphs and Ghibellines more constant, bitter, and bloody than within the walls of Florence. The triumph of one party was usually marked by the massacre or banishment of the leading members of the opposing one. Thus it happened that through the changes of fortune many of the most renowned citizens of Florence were, at one period or another of their career, sent into exile, just as in democratic Athens ostracism was a common fate of defeated party leaders.

Yet, notwithstanding the incessant discord within her walls, Florence during all these troublous times continued to grow in wealth, influence, and fame; and probably we should not be wrong in thinking that many of the illustrious men to whom the city gave birth during this period of strife and turmoil owed their greatness to the seemingly adverse circumstances amidst which their lives were cast. Certainly the *Divine Comedy* owes much to the fact that Dante had tasted the bitterness of misfortune, defeat, and exile.

About the beginning of the fifteenth century Florence fell into the hands of the celebrated Medici,[8] a Florentine family that had grown rich and powerful through mercantile enterprises. Their despotism was maintained, as was that of the first Cæsars at Rome, under the forms of the earlier democratic institutions. These usurpers of liberty were fortunately enlightened despots and made their rule generally acceptable to the Florentines through a munificent patronage extended to artists and scholars, an unstinted liberality in the prosecution of magnificent public works, and the glory they shed upon Florence by the maintenance of a brilliant court.

264. Services to Civilization of the Mediæval Towns. — Modern civilization inherited much from each of the three great centers of mediæval life, — the monastery, the castle, and the town. We have noticed what came out of cloister and of baronial hall, what the monk and what the baron contributed to civilization.[9] We must now see what came out of the town, what contribution the burgher made to European life and culture.

In the first place, the mediæval cities bequeathed to modern times certain valuable economic ideals and principles. It was in the heart of these communities, as within the early Benedictine

[8] The two most distinguished names of the house are those of Cosimo de' Medici (1389–1464), who was called the "Friend of the People and the Father of his Country," and Lorenzo his grandson (1448–1492), who had bestowed upon *him the title of* "The Magnificent."

[9] *See pars. 48* and 155.

monasteries, that labor, almost for the first time in history, if we except the teachings and practices of the Hebrews, was emancipated and the stigma put upon it by slavery and serfdom removed.[10] In the cities of ancient Greece and Italy, speaking generally, trading, save in a large way, and all manual employments were relegated to servile hands; a citizen engaging in business was in some cases punished by being deprived of his citizenship, since he was regarded as having dishonored himself, or, in the words of Plato, as having "thrown dirt on his father's house."[11] In the mediæval towns, on the contrary, it was a very general rule that only the members of the merchant and craft gilds could have lot and part in the municipal government. This meant that here labor had ceased to be servile and was coming to be looked upon, at least by the laborers themselves, as honorable. The industrialism of the towns was based on this new feeling regarding labor. This industrial system, resting on free honorable labor, the towns transmitted to the Modern Age. This, if we except their political gift, was their great bequest.[12]

In the second place, the towns were the cradle of modern commerce, that is of trade on a large scale between widely separated cities and lands. It was through the activity and enterprise of the mediæval merchant and trader that was laid

[10] Serfdom was early extinguished in the towns, which became one of the most powerful agencies, both through direct action and indirect influence, in the abolition of rural serfdom.

[11] "He who in any way shares in the illiberality of retail trades may be indicted by any one who likes for dishonoring his race, before those who are judged to be first in virtue; and if he appear to throw dirt upon his father's house by an unworthy occupation, let him be imprisoned for a year and abstain from that sort of thing."—*Laws*, xi, 919 (Jowett's trans.). So also Aristotle. Speaking of the state which is best governed, he says: "The citizens . . . must not lead the life of mechanics or tradesmen, for such life is ignoble and inimical to virtue."—*Politics*, vii, 9 (Jowett's trans.).

[12] Modern industrialism is as distinctly a product of the mediæval town as modern European aristocracy is a product of the mediæval feudal castle. Both of course have been profoundly modified by the forces of the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Revolution.

the basis of that vast system of international exchange and traffic which forms so characteristic a feature of modern European civilization.

In the third place, the mediæval corporate cities, along with the monasteries, were the foster home of architecture, sculpture, and painting. These things, as has been well said, are "the beautiful flowers of free city life." The old picturesque high-gabled houses, the sculptured gild-halls, the artistic gateways, the superb palaces, and the imposing cathedrals found in so many of the cities of Europe to-day, bear witness to the important place which the mediæval towns hold in the history of architecture and art.

In the fourth place, the towns were the birthplace of modern political liberty. They became such through giving society a new order at a time when political society was made up of orders. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries there were only two classes, or orders, in the state which had participation in the government, — the nobility and the clergy. The inhabitants of the towns grew into a new order destined to a great political future, the so-called *Third Estate*, or *Commons*.[13] During the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, under circumstances which we shall explain in a succeeding chapter, the representatives of the towns came to sit along with the nobles and the clergy in the national diets or parliaments of the different countries.[14] What this meant for the development of modern parliamentary government we shall learn later.

[13] In England the men of the rural districts, that is of the counties, formed from the first, or almost from the first, a part of this order. In other European countries, however, it was not until a later time that the agricultural class came to reinforce the new estate.

[14] In England the towns were first asked to send representatives to Parliament in 1265 (par. 315); in France the delegates of the third estate sat with the lords and clergy for the first time in 1302 (par. 342); in Aragon and Castile the representatives of the cities were admitted to the Cortes in 1133 and 1162 *respectively*; in Germany the deputies of the free imperial cities acquired membership in the Diet during the reign of Henry VII (1308–1313).

In the fifth place, it was the most typical of the free cities, those of Italy, which gave to the world the Renaissance. The extended commercial relations of the Italian trader brought him into communication direct or indirect with Greek and Moor and Tartar, with Moslem and heretic and pagan, with precisely the same consequences for his mental life that wide travel and contact with different peoples and civilizations had for the mental life of the ignorant and intolerant crusader. Furthermore, in these Italian city-republics the participation of the citizen in large public affairs quickened his faculties and widened his intellectual sympathies. Thus it came about that the commercial spirit which dominated these cities, and their free, active, varied, and strenuous political life contributed powerfully to that great essentially intellectual movement known as the Renaissance, which marked the latter part of the Middle Ages, — a movement which next claims our attention.

Sources and Source Material. — Lee's *Source-Book of English History*, § 56, "Charter of the City of London (from Henry I)." Colby's *Selections from the Sources of English History*, p. 70, "A Town Charter." *Translations and Reprints* (Univ. of Penn.), vol. ii, No. 1, "English Towns and Gilds." *European History Studies* (Univ. of Nebraska), vol. ii, Nos. 8 and 9, "The Rise of Cities" and "The Trades of Paris." Toulmin Smith's *English Gilds: the Original Ordinances of more than one hundred Early English Gilds.* A great part of this material is in modern English, many of the French and Latin documents having been translated. The form of most of the others will present no difficulties to the reader of Chaucer's English. MACHIAVELLI (N.), *The History of Florence* (trans. from the Italian; ed. by Henry Morley). This is one of the classics of historical literature. It is only in part a contemporaneous narrative: Machiavelli was born in 1469; he brings his history down to the year 1492.

Secondary or Modern Works. — GUIZOT (F. P. G.), *History of Civilization in Europe*, lect. vii,** "Rise of the Free Cities." GREEN (Mrs. J. R.), ***Town Life in the Fifteenth Century*, 2 vols. GROSS (C.), ***The Gild Merchant*, 2 vols. The best authority on the subject it covers. Brentano's essay is in many respects misleading. ASHLEY (W. J.), *An Introduction to English Economic History and Theory*, vol. i, chap. ii, "Merchant and Craft Gilds"; and vol. ii, chaps. i and ii, entitled

respectively "Supremacy of the Towns" and "Crafts." Also the same author's *The Beginnings of Town Life in the Middle Ages.* ZIMMERN (H.), *The Hansa Towns* (Story of the Nations). SYMONDS (J. A.), *Age of the Despots* (new ed., London, 1897), chaps. iii and iv. This volume forms an introduction to the author's *Renaissance in Italy.* HAZLITT (W. C.), ** *The Venetian Republic* (revised ed., London, 1900), 2 vols. The standard authority in English. WEIL (A.), *Venice* (Story of the Nations), chaps. i–xii. DUFFY (B.), *The Tuscan Republics* (*Florence, Siena, Pisa, and Lucca*) *with Genoa* (Story of the Nations). EMERTON (E.), *Mediæval Europe*, chap. xv (last part). ADAMS (G. B.), *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. xii, "The Growth of Commerce and its Results." CHEYNEY (E. P.), *An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England*, chap. iii, ** "Town Life and Organization"; and chap. iv, ** "Mediæval Trade and Commerce." CUNNINGHAM (W.), *Growth of English Industry and Commerce* (second ed., 1890–92), vol. i; and *Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects* (Mediæval and Modern Times), bk. iv, selected sections. VILLARI (P.), *The Two First Centuries of Florentine History* (trans. by Linda Villari; New York, 1901), 2 vols. A work by one of the most celebrated of living Italian historians. MRS. OLIPHANT, *Makers of Venice.* In the "Mediæval Towns" series there are separate volumes on Florence, Nuremberg, Bruges, etc., which contain chapters of interest.

CHAPTER XVII

THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE SCHOOLMEN

265. Introductory. — "History's true object of study," says Fustel de Coulanges, "is the human mind: it should aspire to know what this mind has believed, thought, and felt in the different ages of the life of the human race."

What we have narrated in preceding chapters respecting mediæval institutions and enterprises will have revealed to the thoughtful reader something at least of both the mind and the heart of the men of the Middle Ages. Nothing, however, mirrors more perfectly the purely intellectual life of those centuries than the universities which the age-spirit called into existence. For this reason we propose in the present chapter to say something of these institutions and of what was taught in them.

266. The Rise and Early Growth of the Universities. — It will be recalled that a significant feature of the work of Charles the Great was the establishment of schools in connection with the cathedrals and monasteries of his realm. From the opening of the ninth till well on into the eleventh century the lamp of learning was fed in these episcopal and monastic schools, although throughout the tenth century the flame burned very low. Closely associated with these church seminaries we find the names of many of the most influential men of the earlier mediæval centuries.

But towards the close of the eleventh and the opening of the twelfth century a new intellectual movement, which was destined to affect profoundly these schools, began to stir Western Christendom. This mental revival was caused by many

agencies, — by the expanding secular life of the towns; by the growing demand for trained professional service in Church and State; and particularly by the quickening influence of the Græco-Arabian culture in Spain and the Orient, with which the Christian West was just now being brought into closer contact through the Crusades.

As a consequence of this newly awakened intellectual life there arose a demand for more advanced and specialized instruction than that given in the cloister schools, and especially for a freer and more secular system of education, one that should prepare a person for entering upon a professional career as a physician, lawyer, or statesman.[1]

It was in response to these new demands that the universities came into existence. Their early history is very obscure for the reason that the most ancient ones, as Laurie says, "grew and were not founded." Some of these were mere expansions of cathedral or monastery schools; others developed out of lay schools which had grown up in commercial towns, especially in the Italian cities, and in which the instruction given was almost wholly secular in character and practical in aim; and still others were new creations which sprang up alongside the existing episcopal and monastic schools and gradually overshadowed them.

The popes patronized the rising schools, "believing that all learning tended to the glory of God and the good of the Church"; emperors and kings granted them charters confirming their already acquired privileges, or granting them fresh

[1] This specialization of instruction was a matter of great significance in the history of education. "The honor of having begun the movement to divide the branches of human knowledge," says Compayré, "and thus prepare the way for modern science belongs to the men of the Middle Ages." The number of faculties in the mediæval university was not fixed. A usual number was four, — the Faculty of Theology, the Faculty of Medicine, the Faculty of Law, and the Faculty of Arts (or Philosophy). The course in arts embraced what is to-day covered by the courses in letters and science, and served as a preparation for entrance upon one of the three specialized professional courses, though most of the students never went beyond it.

immunities, in the expectation that they would prove a bulwark of the imperial or royal authority; cities fostered their growth for the sake of the distinction they conferred and the residents and trade they attracted.[2]

It was about the end of the twelfth and the opening of the thirteenth century when the earliest universities were formally recognized by royal and papal charters. Three of the most ancient universities were the University of Salerno,[3] noted for its teachers in medicine; the University of Bologna, frequented for its instruction in law; and the University of Paris, revered for the authority of its doctors in theology.[4] Bologna and Paris served as models in organization and government for the most of the later universities. The University of Paris gave constitution and rules to so many as to earn the designation of "the Mother of Universities and the Sinai of the Middle Ages."

267. University Organization: the "Nations," or Gilds. — Many features of the mediæval university can be understood only in the light of the fact that in the mediæval town the alien was almost as wholly without rights, both political and civil, as was the alien in a city of ancient Greece, and that in case of most of the universities, not only the students, but the

[2] Thus in the year 1229 the University of Toulouse was established by papal authority as a weapon for combating the Albigensian heresy; in 1158, Frederick Barbarossa granted to students in general, and especially to "professors of divine and sacred laws," various privileges, influenced doubtless by the conviction that the jurists could be depended upon to uphold the imperial claims; and in 1349 Florence, after the ravages of the great plague, founded a university with the aim of filling up the gaps in her population.

[3] Some authorities deny to the school at Salerno the title of university, but it was practically such. It did not, however, long maintain an independent existence; after the establishment of the University of Naples it became in effect the medical department of that institution (in 1231).

[4] The impulse which, in each of at least two of these cases, contributed vastly to develop the existing school into a real university was given by a powerful personality: Irnerius (1070–1138), a learned jurist, gave Bologna its earliest renown; and Abelard (d. 1142), the great philosopher, imparted the impulse which later brought into existence the University of Paris. Constantine, the African (d. 1087), whose name is connected with the early history of the school at Salerno, is a somewhat legendary character.

masters as well, were almost all non-citizens of the towns in which they gathered.[5]

Consequently, for the sake of comradeship, for mutual assistance and "the avenging of injuries," the students, either alone or in connection with their teachers, organized themselves, according to the countries whence they came, into associations, which came to be known as "Nations." At Paris there were four of these groups, at Bologna thirty-six.[6]

These associations were, to all intents and purposes, gilds and reproduced in many features the merchant and trade gilds and the brotherhood of knights, which, just at the time of the beginning of the university movement, were everywhere springing into existence. It was these gilds which exercised or enjoyed the special rights and privileges to which we referred in the preceding paragraph. These privileges very generally included exemption from taxation, from military service, and freedom from the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts. The early universities thus became in a large measure self-governed and self-judged communities, in a word, "literary republics," holding some such relation to the civil authorities of the cities in which they were situated as many of these cities themselves, in the age of independent city life, held to the state.

268. Students and Student Life. — The number of students in attendance at the mediæval universities was large. Contemporaries tell of crowds of fifteen, twenty, and even thirty thousand at the most popular institutions. These numbers

[5] Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, vol. i, p. 153.

[6] There was a wide difference between at least many of the university groups of the South and those of the North. Thus at Bologna the masters, or professors, were excluded from the associations, while at Paris the teaching bodies constituted their governing members. Thus there arose two classes of universities, — the so-called universities of students, where the control was in the hands of the student body, and the universities of doctors, in which the faculties constituted the government. It may here be pointed out that originally the term "university" (*universitas*) meant only a corporation of any sort and was used as freely of the gild of merchants or of artisans as of the gild of teachers or of students.

have been called into question, and it will be safe to consider them, like other mediæval figures, merely as "metaphors for immensity." But that the attendance was numerous is certain, for in those times all who were eager to acquire knowledge — and the intellectual ferment was general — must needs seek some seat of learning, since the scarcity and great cost of manuscript books put home study out of the question. Then, again, many of the pupils attending the non-professional courses were mere boys of twelve or thereabouts, — the high-school pupils of to-day; while, on the other hand, the student body embraced many mature men, among whom were to be counted canons, deans, archdeacons, and other dignitaries. Furthermore, the numbers transmitted to us include many persons who were neither students nor masters, but who were connected by service in various ways with the university and shared the immunities of its members.

Student life in the earlier university period, before the dormitory and college system was introduced, was unregulated and shamefully disorderly. The age was rough and lawless, and the student class were no better than their age; indeed, in some respects they seem to have been worse. For the student body included many rich young profligates who found the universities the most agreeable places for idling away their time, as well as many wild and reckless characters who were constantly engaging in tavern brawls, terrorizing the townsmen at night, even waylaying travelers on the public roads, and committing "many other enormities hateful to God."

Between the students composing the different "Nations" there existed much race prejudice and animosity, which sometimes broke out in unseemly riots in the lecture room. The most serious feuds, however, arose between the students and the townsmen. "Town and gown" disagreements and fights were common, and not unfrequently resulted in the migration to another city of the whole, or practically the whole, body of students and masters.

269. Branches of Study and Method of Instruction. — The advanced studies given greatest prominence in the universities were the three professional branches of theology, medicine, and law. Respecting theology, which as it was taught came to include philosophy proper and much else, we shall say something a little farther on. The science of medicine was in the main the science bequeathed by the Greeks and added to by Arabian and Jewish scholars. The science of law included both civil law and canon law. The natural sciences can hardly be said to have existed, although in alchemy lay hidden the germ of chemistry and in astrology that of astronomy. The Ptolemaic theory, which made the earth the stationary center of the revolving celestial spheres, gave color and form to all conceptions of the structure of the universe.

The method of instruction in all the university departments was the same. It was a servile study of texts, which were regarded with a veneration bordering on superstition and were minutely analyzed, paraphrased, annotated, and commented upon. Thus in theology it was a study of the Bible and particularly of the writings of the Church Fathers and doctors; in medicine, an explanation of the works of Hippocrates and Galen with their Arabian commentators Avicenna and Averroës; in natural science, a study of the physics of Aristotle; in civil law, a commentary on the works of the *Corpus Juris* of Justinian, and in canon law, on the decisions and edicts of popes and councils. Not even in the physical sciences was there any serious appeal to experience, to observation, to experiment. In anatomy, discussions took the place of dissections.[7] Books were considered better authority than nature herself. "Aristotle," says Ueberweg, "was regarded as the founders of religions are wont to be considered." One venturing to criticise this "Master of those who know" was looked upon as presumptuous and irreverent.

[7] At Bologna, where anatomical study was most advanced, each student witnessed only one dissection during the year.

This mode of study resulted in part from an imitation of the method followed in theology, which was perforce a study of texts held as authoritative and infallible; and in part from the lack of books, which made dictation by the teacher and note-taking and memorizing by the student the only practicable mode of carrying on the work of the lecture room.

The ordinary classes met in private rooms or hired apartments. Mass meetings of the "Nations" and other large assemblages were held in some convenient cathedral or convent church borrowed for the occasion. The university itself had at first neither dormitories nor halls.[8] The modern method of creating a university was reversed. As Dr. Jessopp says, "the men came first; the bricks and mortar followed long after."

270. Scholasticism; the Province of the Schoolmen. — Springing up within the early ecclesiastical schools and developed within the later universities, there came into existence a method of philosophizing which, from the place of its origin, was called Scholasticism, while its representatives were called Schoolmen, or Scholastics.

The chief task of the Schoolmen was the reducing of Christian doctrines to scientific form, the harmonizing of revelation and reason, of faith and science. The instrument employed by them in their work was logic, the logic of Aristotle, that is, formal, syllogistic reasoning. By the use of this instrument it was thought possible to build up a science of theology which, like the science of geometry, should consist of indisputable theorems and corollaries resting upon a foundation of axioms and exact definitions. Every Christian doctrine was thus to receive a logical, scientific demonstration, a demonstration so complete and absolute as to compel the belief of everybody, — skeptics, pagans, and Saracens.

[8] It was this poverty of the university which rendered so easy those migrations or secessions of dissatisfied students and masters of which we hear so frequently. Nothing prevented them, if they felt themselves wronged by the local authorities, from fleeing from one city to another. Several of the younger universities originated in such movements.

We should note that the typical Schoolmen did not question the truth or soundness of the theology of the Church; they accepted all the writings of the Fathers, the canons and decrees of popes and councils, as unquestionably true. They did not ask, *Are* these things so? but simply, *How* and *why* are they so? Thus they did not doubt that the bread and wine in the eucharist are changed into real flesh and blood, but they sought to know the necessity and manner of the change; they did not doubt the existence of angels, but they reasoned about the different angelic orders and the mode of their existence; they did not doubt that man is redeemed by the sufferings and death of Christ, but they asked about the necessity of the atonement and the mode of substitution. Surely there must be a reason for everything, they insisted, and God has given us our reasoning faculty that we might search out final causes. And so, with no instrument save the logic of Aristotle, they fell to work upon the stupendous mass of church doctrines with the purpose of reducing all to rational order and system. Organizing, explaining, justifying, harmonizing, putting in categories and syllogisms, — such was the work of the Schoolmen.

The Schoolmen, however, soon came to realize that there are some matters of revelation — as, for instance, the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Resurrection — which cannot be demonstrated. Therefore these and similar teachings of the Church were, by the later Scholastics, taken out of the arena of debate and set aside as "mysteries of revelation," which were to be received by faith alone.

271. The Earlier Schoolmen; Abelard. — John Scotus Erigena, an Irish teacher and philosopher, whom Charles the Bald, grandson of Charles the Great, invited to France to take charge of the court school, is sometimes called the first of the Schoolmen; but more generally this place is given to Saint Anselm (1033–1109), abbot of the monastery of Bec in Normandy and later archbishop of Canterbury in

England.[9] The maxim of this typical Schoolman was: "I believe in order that I may understand" (*credo ut intelligam*). His mental viewpoint is still further revealed by his declaration that "true philosophy is true religion, and true religion is true philosophy."

But by far the most eminent of the early Schoolmen was Peter Abelard (1079–1142). His masters at Paris were the celebrated Scholastic theologians Roscelin and William of Champeaux. To the last named, the presumptuous and precocious pupil brought mortifying discomfiture in argument in his own lecture room, and then soon afterwards set up for himself as a lecturer on the most abstruse metaphysical and theological subjects. He was "an incomparable seducer of minds and hearts." Such a teacher the world had probably not produced since Socrates enchained the youth of Athens. At Paris over five thousand pupils are said to have thronged his lecture room. Driven by the shame of a public scandal and by persecution to seek retirement, he hid himself first in a monastery and later in a solitude near the city of Troyes. But his admirers followed him into the wilds in such multitudes that a veritable university sprang up around him in his desert retreat.

Abelard carried to an extreme the tendency of the Scholastics to rationalize everything. "A doctrine is believed," he taught, "not because God has said it, but because we are convinced by reason that it is so." He declared doubt to be the starting-point in the quest of knowledge, and, apparently with the object of producing this desirable state of mind in his disciples, wrote a book entitled *Sic et Non* ("So and Not So"), which was a collection of mutually contradictory opinions of the Church Fathers on every conceivable theological question.

[9] With Saint Anselm begins practically the great Scholastic controversy of the Nominalists and Realists, which never wholly ceased in the mediæval schools. This debate was a renewal, in a somewhat changed form, of that begun in ancient Greece by Aristotle's criticism of Plato's doctrine of *ideas*. For an account of this prolonged discussion the student must have recourse to works on philosophy.

The church conservatives became frightened at this rationalizing philosophy. Bernard of Clairvaux, preacher of the Second Crusade, entered the lists against the presumptuous champion of the human reason. Bernard's principle was that man acquires a knowledge of divine things by way of the heart and not by way of the intellect. "God is known," he finely said, "in proportion as he is loved." He charged Abelard with pride of intellect: "There is nothing in heaven or on earth," he said, "that he does not claim to know." He complained that no place was left for faith; the human reason usurped everything.

In the opposing maxims and viewpoints of Abelard and Bernard is admirably revealed the irreconcilable opposition between the emotional religion known as Mysticism and the rationalism of such Schoolmen as Abelard.

The temper of the times was against Abelard. Certain of his opinions were condemned by two church councils, and he was forced to burn part of his writings. This was one of the most noteworthy collisions between ecclesiastical authority and freedom of thought during the Middle Ages.

Abelard's brilliant reputation as a philosopher was tarnished by grave faults of character. Intrusted with the education of a fascinating and mentally gifted maiden, Héloïse by name, Abelard betrayed the confidence reposed in him. A secret marriage bound in a tragic fate the lives of teacher and pupil. The "tale of Abelard and Héloïse" forms one of the most romantic yet saddest traditions of the twelfth century.

272. Scholasticism in the Thirteenth Century; Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. — The thirteenth century witnessed a fresh development of Scholasticism. The impulse to this renewed intellectual activity came to the Christian West, like many similar incitements, from ancient Greece. It came at this time through various channels, — through the Arabian schools in Spain; through the south Italian land, where the Græco-Arabic learning had found an imperial patron in Frederick II; and through the close relations established

between the Latin West and the Greek East by the conquest of Constantinople by the crusaders.

Before the end of the first quarter of the thirteenth century, through these various channels and agencies, all the works of Aristotle were for the first time brought to the knowledge of the Schoolmen. Before this it was chiefly his logic which was known to them; but now all his other works were translated into Latin, at first from Arabic or Hebrew versions, and then later directly from the Greek text. Along with the works of Aristotle the Schoolmen came into possession of the writings of his Arabic and Jewish commentators.[10]

It would be difficult to exaggerate the stimulating influence of these fresh philosophical and scientific acquisitions upon the Christian thinkers of the West.[11] The great age of Scholasticism now opened. The universities of Paris and Oxford were the chief centers of the new movement; the Mendicant Orders furnished its most illustrious representatives.

From the Dominican Order came Albertus Magnus, or "Albert the Great" (1193–1280), who was called "the second Aristotle," and Thomas Aquinas (1225 or 1227–1274), known as "the Angelic Doctor."[12] Thomas was the beloved pupil of Albert. As philosophers these Schoolmen stand to each other in some such relation as did Plato and Aristotle, nor are their names unworthy of being linked with the names of those great thinkers of ancient Greece.

The reputation of Aquinas as the greatest Scholastic and theologian of the Middle Ages rests largely upon his prodigious

[10] The names of greatest renown here are those of the Arabian philosophers and physicians, Avicenna (980–1038) of the East, and Averroës (d. 1198) of the West, he who, in Dante's phrase, "the great comment made" (*Inferno*, canto iv); and that of the Jewish scholar and philosopher, Moses Maimonides (1135–1204).

[11] The first Schoolman who seems to have had before him all the works of Aristotle was Alexander of Hales (d. 1245).

[12] Another name second in renown only to those of these great Schoolmen is that of Bonaventura (1221–1274), who received the title of "the Seraphic Doctor." He was a Franciscan monk and was rather a Mystic than a Scholastic.

work entitled *Summa Theologiæ*, or "Sum of Theology." In its ponderous folios all revealed truth, all the doctrines of the Church, and all related knowledge are systematically arranged and welded by irrefragable logic into an all-comprehending and absolute science.[18]

The work is regarded as the standard of orthodoxy in the Catholic Church. Pope Leo XIII (1878–), in an encyclical letter, prescribes it as "the best light of all places of learning" and exhorts all teachers "to instill the doctrines of Thomas Aquinas into the minds of their hearers."

In connection with Thomas Aquinas must be mentioned Duns Scotus (d. 1308), a British Franciscan monk, whose keen analytical intellect caused him to be called "the Subtle Doctor." "The mind of Duns Scotus," says Dean Milman, "might seem a wonderful reasoning machine; whatever was thrown into it came out in syllogisms." The amount of this kind of mental product turned out by Duns the same historian declares to be "the most wonderful fact in the intellectual history of our race."

Duns Scotus combated certain of the speculative opinions of Thomas Aquinas and became the head of a rival school of philosophy, the adherents of which were known as Scotists, while the followers of his opponent bore the name of Thomists.

273. The Scientific Side of Scholasticism; Roger Bacon. — The typical Schoolman was a logician, and speculative subjects connected with theology were his supreme interest; yet there were some Schoolmen who devoted themselves largely to physical science, and sought to gain a knowledge of nature, not alone through books, but by direct personal observation

[18] This was not the first attempt of the kind. In the twelfth century Peter of Lombard (d. 1164) wrote his famous *Four Books of Sentences*, which earned for him the title of "the Master of Sentences." This work, which served in some sort as a basis for the *Summa* by Aquinas, consisted mainly of a collection of short quotations from the writings of the Church Fathers and doctors. It was one of the most popular text-books ever written. It held its place in the schools as a manual of theology for more than three hundred years.

and study of nature herself. The impulse to this study of the natural sciences was communicated to Christian scholars mainly through their contact with Greek and Arabian learning. Thus Gerbert, who in the year 999 became pope under the name of Sylvester II, is said to have studied in Spain and to have brought into Christian Europe valuable scientific knowledge gained in the Arabian schools.

At a later period, after that fresh contact to which we have just referred of Western Europe with Græco-Arabic culture, Albert the Great blended in a strange way Aristotelian philosophy with Arabian science. He made valuable discoveries in chemistry and was believed by his superstitious age to employ unseen and spirit agencies in his laboratory.

But the most noteworthy representative of the scientific activity of the Scholastic age was the English Franciscan friar, Roger Bacon (d. 1294), called "the Wonderful Doctor," on account of his marvelous knowledge of mechanics, optics, chemistry, and other sciences. He understood the composition of gunpowder, or a similar explosive. In one of his works he says that "wagons and ships could be built which would propel themselves with the swiftness of an arrow, without horses and without sails." [14] His contemporaries believed him to be in league with the devil. He certainly was in league with the Arabian scholars, whose works he studied. He suffered persecution and was imprisoned for fourteen years.

Roger Bacon's greatest bequest to posterity was a book called *Opus Majus*, in which is anticipated in a wonderful way those principles of modern inductive science laid down by Francis Bacon in the seventeenth century. "The advance of sound historical judgment," says Andrew D. White, "seems likely to bring the fame of the two who bear the name of Bacon nearly to equality." [15] It is with justice that the earlier Bacon has been called "the pioneer of modern science."

[14] Quoted by Erdmann, *History of Philosophy*, vol. i, § 212, 9.

[15] *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology*, vol. i, p. 386.

274. The Last of the Schoolmen. — The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries witnessed the decline of Scholasticism. The Englishman William Occam (d. 1347) is generally regarded as the last distinguished Schoolman.[16] Scholastic debate in the hands of unworthy successors of the great philosophers of the thirteenth century fell away, for the most part, into barren, frivolous disputations over idle and impossible questions. The representatives of this degenerate Scholasticism became the objects of the unmeasured scorn and ridicule of the men of the New Learning brought in by that revival of classical culture which marked the later mediæval age. The low estimation in which the Schoolmen of this period came to be held is disclosed in the history of our word *dunce*. Originally applied as an appellation of honor to a disciple of the great Duns or to any learned person, the term at this time, being ironically applied to the stupid Scholastic opposed to classical studies, came to acquire its present meaning of a preposterous dolt.

275. Criticism of the Schoolmen. — The Schoolmen have had much reproach heaped upon them. This censure, as we have already intimated, is merited only when applied to the ignorant Scholastics of the waning age of Scholasticism. When applied to the Schoolmen as a whole, nothing could be more unjust.

Thus the Scholastics are reproached for having adopted logic, instead of the modern scientific method of observation and experiment, as the instrument for testing and discovering truth, and thereby having condemned the mediæval intellect for centuries to weary and profitless toil in a mental treadmill.

It is true that it is difficult for us to understand the Schoolmen's passion for logic; and it is equally true that by this path men could make no real advance in knowledge. But the true student of history who has learned in what degree the mental and spiritual activities of any given age are determined

[16] The appellation "the last of the Schoolmen" is, however, by some given to the German philosopher Gabriel Biel (d. 1495).

by the fixed environment of that age, will no more think of blaming the Schoolmen for these things than of chiding them for having been born in the mediæval instead of in the modern age.

Again, the Schoolmen are reproached for having fostered the mental habit of servile submission to authority. This fault — if fault it be — was merely an exaggeration of what is still among ourselves accounted a virtue; for many of the greatest scholars and thinkers of to-day, in all religious matters, bow to authority, — to the authority either of the Scriptures or of the Church, or of both, and in so far are Schoolmen. Some scientists even feel it incumbent upon them to show that their conclusions in the natural-science studies are not in conflict with the teachings of the Bible. In all such attempts to reconcile science and theology, these modern scholars are merely continuing in part the work of the mediæval philosophers. In the case of the Schoolmen, this submission to authority is a more obtrusive fact than in the case of modern scholars, because theology was then practically the sum total of all the sciences, and consequently embraced almost all subjects upon which the mediæval mind could exercise itself.

276. The Services of the Schoolmen to Intellectual Progress. — The Schoolmen fill a large place in the history of the intellectual development of the race. They rendered in this relation two distinct and important services.

In the first place, by their ceaseless debates and argumentation they stimulated to activity the mediæval intellect and disciplined it in the processes of exact reasoning. They made the universities of the time real mental gymnasia in which the European mind received incomparable formal training and indispensable preparation for its later and, happily, more fruitful work. Their system produced intellectual athletes. In penetration of intellect, in subtlety of analysis, in precision of definition, in skill in dialectics, the greatest of the Schoolmen have never been surpassed.

In the second place, the Schoolmen rendered a great service to the cause of intellectual freedom. This assertion at first blush may appear paradoxical, when one recalls that the submission of the reason to church authority was one of the fundamental maxims of the orthodox Schoolmen. But the place they gave the human reason and the constant appeal they made to it was preparing the way for the full and plain assertion of the principle of the freedom of thought. "Scholasticism as a whole," says Professor Seth, "may be justly regarded as the history of the growth and gradual emancipation of reason which was completed in the movements of the Renaissance and the Reformation."

Sources and Source Material. — *Translations and Reprints* (Univ. of Penn.), vol. ii, No. 3, "The Mediæval Student." This contains valuable material on "Privileges of the Students," "The Courses of Study," "Condemnation of Errors," and "Life of the Students." Henderson's *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, pp. 262–266, "The Foundation of the University of Heidelberg, A.D. 1386." DANTE, *Divina Commedia* (trans. by Longfellow). There is much of the spirit, the form, and the substance of Scholasticism in this great mediæval poem, for, after Aristotle, the Schoolmen Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas were Dante's masters in philosophy and science. An admirable bit of Scholastic reasoning and exposition will be found in canto vii of the *Paradiso*, where Beatrice discourses on "the Incarnation, the Immortality of the soul, and the Resurrection of the body."

Secondary or Modern Works. — RASHDALL (H.), ** *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols. LAURIE (S. S.), ** *The Rise and Early Constitution of Universities* (International Education Series). COMPAYRÉ (G.), ** *Abelard, and the Origin and Early History of Universities* (The Great Educators). JESSOPP (A.), *The Coming of the Friars*, chap. vi, "The Building up of a University." POOLE (R. L.), *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought.* CHURCH (R. W.), *Saint Anselm.* ALLEN (J. H.), *Christian History in its Three Great Periods*, chap. viii, "Scholastic Theology." UEBERWEG (F.), *History of Philosophy* (from the German), vol. i, pp. 355–467. TOWNSEND (W. J.), *The Great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages.* VAUGHAN (R. B.), *The Life and Labours of S. Thomas of Aquin*, 2 vols. The abridged edition published in 1875 will best serve the ends of the ordinary reader. HAMPDEN (R. D.), *The Life of Thomas Aquinas: A*

Dissertation on the Scholastic Philosophy of the Middle Ages (1848). A little book well adapted to the use of elementary classes. TRENCH (R. C.), *Lectures on Mediæval Church History*, lects. xiv and xviii. HURST (J. F.), *History of the Christian Church*, vol. i, pp. 867–888. MILMAN (H. H.), *History of Latin Christianity*, vol. iv, bk. viii, chap. v; vol. viii, bk. xiv, chap. iii. ALZOG (J.), *Universal Church History* (from the German), vol. ii, pp. 728–784. FISHER (G. P.), *History of the Christian Church*, pp. 208–226. STILLÉ (C. J.), *Studies in Mediæval History*, chap. xiii, "Scholastic Philosophy — The Schoolmen — Universities." MORISON (J. C.), *The Life and Times of Saint Bernard*, and STORRS (R. S.), *Bernard of Clairvaux*. In each of these works will be found an interesting account of Bernard's controversy with Abelard. In Epochs of Church History: MULLINGER (J. B.), *A History of the University of Cambridge*, chaps. i–iii; and BRODRICK (G. C.), *A History of the University of Oxford*, chaps. i–vi. WHEWELL (W.), *History of the Inductive Sciences*, 2 vols. For Roger Bacon and the science of the Middle Ages. Consult also articles on "Universities" and "Scholasticism" in the *Encyc. Brit.*, and for the Scholastic Theology, the various histories of Philosophy.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE RENAISSANCE

I. The Renaissance before the Renaissance

277. The Renaissance defined. — By the term "Renaissance," used in its narrower sense, is meant that new enthusiasm for classical literature, learning, and art which sprang up in Italy towards the close of the Middle Ages, and which during the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries gave a new culture to Europe.[1]

Used in a broader sense the word designates the transition from the mediæval to the modern age. Symonds employs it to characterize "the movement by which the nations of Western Europe passed from the mediæval to modern modes of thought and life."

Michelet's famous definition of the Renaissance as "the discovery of the world and of man" is essentially the same as Symonds's; nor is Pater's conception different when he declares the fruit of the revival to have been "a new love of the things of the intellect and the imagination."

The movement again may be viewed as an intellectual revolt, like the religious revolt of the sixteenth century, and then defined as a protest against mediæval asceticism and mediæval restraints. It is well indeed to view it from this standpoint,

[1] By many writers the term is employed in a still narrower sense than this, being used to designate merely the revival of classical art; but this is to depreciate the most important phase of a many-sided development. The Renaissance was essentially an intellectual movement. It is this intellectual quality which gives it so large a place in universal history — in the religious, political, and social development of the race.

since then we see it in its proper and causal relation to those other two great revolutionary movements of modern history which we call the Reformation and the Political Revolution.[2]

All these definitions and characterizations may be suggestively summarized in this way: The Renaissance was the rebirth into the world of that secular, inquiring, self-reliant spirit which characterized the life and culture of classical antiquity. This is simply to say that under the influence of the intellectual revival the men of Western Europe came to think and feel, to look upon life and the outer world, as did the men of ancient Greece and Rome. It was this similarity in mental viewpoint that caused the men of the Renaissance to recognize kindred spirits in the men of Græco-Roman times, which awakened in them such an unbounded admiration for everything relating to classical antiquity, and which made the revival movement in Italy, the country of its birth, to consist almost exclusively in a passionate effort to recover all that could then be recovered of the long-lost heritage of classical civilization.

278. **Presages of the Renaissance.** — Just as the mediæval age was full of presages of the Reformation, so was it full of presages of the Renaissance. All along through the centuries before the fourteenth there were constantly appearing signs and omens, in mental unrest, longings, and stirrings, which plainly foreshadowed the coming change and revolution in the intellectual world. Sometimes the new spirit awoke in a single individual, who seemed thereby set apart from his generation, misunderstood and distrusted by his contemporaries, a man born into the world out of time; and then again the new spirit passed as a breath over a land or over a generation and stirred the universal soul.

In some of these awakenings of the soul of mediæval humanity the movement seems to have been — so obscure and deeply hidden are the inciting causes — simply an outbreak of the

[2] Compare pars. 2 and 276.

native energies of the growing and maturing soul of the new races; but almost always when we can trace the influences at work the intellectual ferment is seen to be caused by the direct or indirect contact of the mediæval mind with the thought and learning and culture of classical antiquity — so true is it that life can come only from preëxistent life.

279. The Carolingian Revival of the Ninth Century. — To the most noteworthy of these intellectual movements precursory of the Renaissance our attention has already been drawn in the course of the preceding narrative. We have noticed the Carolingian revival of the ninth century, which had its point of departure in the life and work of the great Charles. In this early Renaissance the elements and forces of the Græco-Roman civilization were actively at work; but the movement was premature. The time had not yet come for the mediæval men to enter into the inheritance of the ancient world of culture. The descent of the great Charles into the tomb was like the sinking of the sun. Darkness again settled over Europe. Yet the light of that premature dawn never wholly faded out of the sky of the mediæval world.

280. The Crusades in their Relation to the Renaissance. — It was the Crusades, as we pointed out in summarizing the effects of those expeditions,[8] that contributed essentially to relieve the darkness that followed the eclipse of the Carolingian revival, to break the mental lethargy that had fallen upon the European mind, and to awaken in the nations of Western Europe the spirit of a new life. We need not here repeat what was said in that connection, save merely to recall how those enterprises of Christendom — largely through bringing the Christian West into touch with the Græco-Arabian schools of Alexandria, Cairo, and Bagdad, and with the more distant centers of science, Balkh, Ispahan, and Samarcand — initiated or fostered social and intellectual movements of vast and far-reaching consequences. Before the Crusades closed, the way

[8] Compare pars. 225–228.

of the Renaissance was already prepared. In every territory of human activity the paths along which advances were to be made by the men of coming generations had been marked out, and in many directions trodden by the eager feet of the pioneers of the new life and culture.

281. The Development of Vernacular Literatures as an Expression of the New Spirit. — The awakening of this new spirit in the Western nations is especially observable in the growth and development of their vernacular literatures. It was, speaking broadly, during and just after the crusading centuries that the native tongues of Europe found a voice — began to form literatures of their own. We have in another place spoken of the formation and gradual growth of some of the most important of these languages.[4] As soon as their forms became somewhat settled, then literature was possible, and all these speeches bud and blossom into song and romance. In Spain the epic poem of the *Cid*, a reflection of Castilian chivalry, forms the beginning of Spanish literature; in the south of France, the Troubadours fill the land with the melody of their love-songs; in the north, the Trouveurs recite the stirring romances of Charlemagne and his paladins, of King Arthur and the Holy Grail; in Germany, the harsh strains of the *Nibelungen Lied* are followed by the softer notes of the Minnesingers; in Italy, Dante sings his *Divine Comedy* in the pure mellifluous tongue of Tuscany, and creates a language for the Italian race; in England, Chaucer writes his *Canterbury Tales*, and completes the fusion of Saxon and Norman into the English tongue.

This formation of the modern European languages and the growth of native literatures foreshadowed the approaching Renaissance; for there was in these literatures a note of freedom, a note of protest against mediæval asceticism and ecclesiastical restraint. And at the same time that this literary development heralded the coming intellectual revival it

[4] Compare pars. 53 and 54.

hastened its advance; for the light songs, tales, and romances of these vernacular literatures, unlike the learned productions of the Schoolmen, which were in Latin and addressed only to a limited class, appealed to the masses and thus stirred the universal mind and heart of Europe.

282. The Albigensian Revolt. — Most plainly does the free, secular, protesting spirit that inspired these native literatures reveal itself in the Provençal or Albigensian movement of the twelfth and the early part of the thirteenth century (par. 221). This was in reality not so much a religious movement as an intellectual, social, and literary development. There were at work in it foreign influences, Oriental and classical, yet in the main the Provençal innovators and poets drew their inspiration directly from nature. The movement was essentially a spontaneous outbreak of genuine and irrepressible human instincts and impulses.

It seems as though this Provençal development should have constituted the formal and definite beginnings of the Renaissance — as though Provence, instead of Italy, should have been the hearth and propagating center of the great intellectual revival. But the appearance of this self-assertive, secular, modern spirit awakened the apprehensions of the Church and stirred it to the use of stern measures of repression. The cruel crusades which drowned in blood the Albigensian heresy also quenched the light of the new culture.

283. The Sicilian Revival under Frederick II. — Another pre-Renaissance movement, one less popular and spontaneous in its character, however, than the movement having Provence as its center, is that associated with the name of Emperor Frederick II (1212–1250), of whom we have already spoken in connection with the struggle between the empire and the papacy (par. 234). Frederick possessed that many-sidedness of nature, that freedom from religious narrowness and bigotry, that spirit of mental independence and self-reliance which characterized the men of the Renaissance. In a word, he was

a modern man. That he lived so many centuries in advance of his contemporaries is attributable not only to the fresh native vigor of an intellect perhaps the most forceful of the mediæval time, but also to the subtle influences of an environment electric from the collision of Oriental and Occidental social and religious systems, and saturated with the elements of the life and thought of Græco-Roman antiquity.

Frederick played the rôle of a Mæcenas. He caused the translation into Latin of certain of the works of Aristotle and Averroës, founded the University of Naples, and made his court at Palermo a refuge for the exiled minstrels of the Albigensian persecution. Thus, under his patronage there sprang up in the soft Sicilian lands an intellectual and literary development like that which gave distinction to the court of many an Italian despot of the true age of the Renaissance.

But this intellectual dawn in the South, like that in the North, was foredoomed to a premature eclipse. Whatever of promise there may have been in the movement was destroyed by the same hand that accomplished the ruin of the Provençal culture. The revival, however, left some traces behind. Those gleams of Græco-Roman and Arabian culture which illumined Europe in the thirteenth century radiated in part from the brilliant court of Frederick II.

284. Town Life and Lay Culture. — The spirit of the new life was nourished not less in the air of the great cities than in the atmosphere of princely courts. In speaking of mediæval town life we noticed how within the towns there was early developed a life like that of modern times. The atmosphere of these bustling, trafficking cities called into existence a practical commercial spirit, a many-sided, independent, secular life which in many respects was directly opposed to mediæval teachings and ideals.

This intellectual and social movement within the mediæval towns, especially in the great city-republics of Italy, was related

most intimately, as we shall see in a moment, to that great revival of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries to which the term "Renaissance" is distinctively applied.

285. Scholasticism and the Modern Spirit. — The history of Scholasticism, a short outline of which we gave in the chapter immediately preceding this, constitutes an important part not only of the history of Mediævalism but also of the history of the Renaissance. For, as we there noticed, there were at work in Scholasticism two mutually opposing principles and tendencies, two spirits striving together, the mediæval and the modern. Thus Abelard in intellectual bent and temper, in the originality and adventurousness of his thought, in the claims he made for the human reason, belongs rather to the modern than to the mediæval world.

Indeed, thinking of Scholasticism as a whole, we may say that there lay hidden in it the germ of the principle of freedom of thought, — a characteristic quality, as we shall learn, of the Renaissance.

286. Dante as a Precursor of the Renaissance. — We have already spoken the name of Dante, but the great place he holds in the intellectual history of the race requires that we should speak with some detail of the relation which he sustained to the age which, just as he appeared, was passing away, and to the new age which was then approaching.

Dante Alighieri, "the fame of the Tuscan people," was born at Florence in 1265. He was exiled by the Florentines in 1302, and at the courts of friends learned how hard a thing it is "to climb the stairway of a patron." He died at Ravenna in 1321, and his tomb there is a place of pilgrimage to-day.

It was during the years of his exile that Dante wrote his immortal poem, the *Commedia* as named by himself, because of its happy ending; the *Divina Commedia*, or the "Divine Comedy," as called by his admirers, — a work which well illustrates these words of Burckhardt: "Banishment has this effect above all, that either it wears the exile out or develops

whatever is greatest in him." Of his labor upon the poem Dante himself says: "For many years it has made me lean."

The *Divine Comedy* has been called the "Epic of Mediævalism." It is an epitome of the life and thought of the Middle Ages. Dante's theology is the theology of the mediæval Church; his philosophy is the philosophy of the Schoolmen; his science is the science of his time. He believes with his contemporaries that the papacy and the empire were divinely instituted, the one to rule the world in matters spiritual, the other in matters temporal; he shares the mediæval belief in the influence of the stars; he has the mediæval fear and hatred of heresy.

But although Dante viewed the world from a standpoint which was essentially that of the mediæval age which was passing away, still he was in a profound sense a prophet of the new age which was approaching, — a forerunner of the Renaissance. He was such in his feeling for classical antiquity. When he speaks lovingly of Vergil as his teacher and master, the one from whom he took the beautiful style that had done him honor,[5] he reveals how he has come to look with other than mediæval eyes upon the Augustan poet. His modern attitude towards Græco-Roman culture is further shown in his free use of the works of the classical writers; the illustrative material of his great poem is drawn almost as largely from classical as from Hebrew and Christian sources. Again, in his self-reliant judgment, in his critical spirit, in his intense individualism, Dante exhibits intellectual traits which we recognize as belonging rather to the modern than to the mediæval man.

287. The Fresh Stimulus from the Side of Classical Antiquity. — We have now reached the opening of the fourteenth century. We have looked through the mediæval centuries for evidences of the awakening of the modern spirit. We have noted the Carolingian revival of the ninth century; we have witnessed how the narrow circle of men's thoughts and interests were

[5] *Inferno*, i, 85–87.

widened by the Crusades; we have seen the modern languages, enriched and matured by the fusion of races and the growth of centuries, developing their rich stores of myth and legend into suggestive and promising literatures; we have observed the quickening influence upon the European mind of its first contact with Græco-Arabian culture; we have encountered the modern spirit within the trading, commercial towns; we have seen the European mind aroused and disciplined by the debates of the disputatious Schoolmen; and we have traced in the great wide-horizoned soul of Dante indications of the dawn of a new age.

Having acquainted ourselves with these mental experiences of the men of the mediæval time, having observed the progress made by the human soul during the mediæval centuries, we might easily be led to suppose that the European intellect would now be able to make an uninterrupted advance by virtue of its own inherent powers and native resources, without any further aids or incitements from the past than such as had been already received. But however this may be, the intellectual progress of Europe received just at this time a tremendous impulse from the more perfect recovery of the inestimable treasures of the civilization of Græco-Roman antiquity, so that we can only conjecture what modern history and culture would be like had the mental and spiritual development now well under way not felt the fresh impulse imparted to it through this closer and more vital contact with the literature and learning and art of the great past of the classical peoples.

So far-reaching and transforming was the influence of the old world of culture upon the nations of Western Europe that the Renaissance, viewed as the transition from the mediæval to the modern age, may properly be regarded as beginning with its discovery, or rediscovery, and the appropriation of its riches by the Italian scholars. In the following section we shall try to give some account of this Renaissance movement in its earlier stages and as it manifested itself in Italy.

II. The Renaissance in Italy

288. Inciting Causes of the Movement. — Just as the Reformation went forth from Germany and the Political Revolution from France, so did the Renaissance go forth from Italy. And this was not an accident. The Renaissance had its beginnings in Italy for the reason that all those agencies which were the inciting causes of those earlier mental awakenings of which we have spoken were here more energetic and effective in their workings than elsewhere.

Foremost among these causes must be placed the influence of the Italian cities. We have already seen how city life was more perfectly developed in Italy than in the other countries of Western Europe. In the air of the great Italian city-republics there was nourished a strong, energetic, self-reliant, secular, many-sided life. It was a political, intellectual, and artistic life like that of the cities of ancient Greece. Florence, for example, became a second Athens, and in the eager air of that city individual talent and faculty were developed as of old in the atmosphere of the Attic capital. "In Florence," says Symonds, "had been produced such glorious human beings as the world has rarely seen. . . . The whole population formed an aristocracy of genius."

In a word, life in Italy earlier than elsewhere lost its mediæval characteristics and assumed those of the modern type. We may truly say that the Renaissance was cradled in the cities of mediæval Italy. The Italians, to use again the words of Symonds, were "the first-born among the sons of modern Europe."

A second circumstance that doubtless contributed to make Italy the birthplace of the modern spirit was the intrusion into the peninsula of so many different races, — Goths, Lombards, Franks, Saracens, Normans, and Germans. Such collisions and interminglings of human stocks as took place there, such contacts and fusions of different civilizations — Roman, Byzantine,

Arabian — could not but produce a mental ferment and induce social and intellectual movements of far-reaching consequences.

A third circumstance that helped to make Italy the foster home of the Renaissance was the character of its schools and universities. In these institutions secular and practical studies, as for instance Roman law and medicine, held the place which was given the Scholastic theology in the universities of the North. This emphasis laid upon secular learning helped to prepare the ground in Italy for receiving the seed of the new lay culture of the Renaissance.

A fourth circumstance was the fact that in Italy the break between the old and the new civilization was not so complete as it was in the other countries of Western Europe. The Italians were closer in language and in blood to the old Romans than were the other new-forming nations. They regarded themselves as the direct descendants and heirs of the old conquerors of the world. This consciousness of kinship with the men of a great past exerted an immense influence upon the imagination of the Italians and tended not only to preserve the continuity of the historical development in the peninsula, but also to set as the first task of the emancipated Italian genius the recovery and appropriation of the culture of antiquity.

But more potent than all other agencies, not so much in awakening the Italian intellect as in determining the direction of its activities after they were once aroused by other inciting causes, was the existence in the peninsula of so many monuments of the civilization and the grandeur of ancient Rome. The cities themselves were, in a very exact sense, fragments of the old empire; and everywhere in the peninsula the ground was covered with ruins of the old Roman builders. The influence which these reminders of a glorious past exerted upon sensitive souls is illustrated by the biographies of such men as Arnold of Brescia, Villani, Rienzi, and Petrarch.

There is need here, however, of caution. For while it is true that the monuments of antiquity helped to awaken the

new spirit of the Renaissance, it is equally true that it was the new spirit already awakened that restored life to antiquity. This relation of the genius of the Renaissance to the Græco-Roman past is finely set forth by the words, often quoted, of one of the most zealous of the early students of classical antiquities: "I go," he said, as about to set out on a quest among the ancient ruins, "I go to awaken the dead." It was because a new life was already stirring in the Italians that the memorials of ancient Greece and Rome cast such a spell upon them; for, in the words of the mystic, "to a stone, the universe is a stone."

289. The Two Phases of the Italian Renaissance. — It was, as we have already intimated, the nearness of the Italians to the classical past that caused the Renaissance in Italy to assume essentially the character of a classical revival, — a recovery and appropriation by the Italians of the long-neglected heritage of Græco-Roman civilization.

The movement here consisted of two distinct yet closely related phases: namely, (1) the revival of classical literature and learning, and (2) the revival of classical art. It is with the first only, the intellectual and literary phase of the movement, that we shall be chiefly concerned. This feature of the movement is called distinctively "Humanism," and the promoters of it are known as "Humanists," because of their interest in the study of the classics, the *literæ humaniores*, or the "more human letters," in opposition to the diviner letters, that is, theology, which made up the old education.

290. Petrarch,[6] the First of the Humanists. — "Not only in the history of Italian literature, but in that of the civilized world, and not only in this but in the history of the human mind . . . Petrarch's name shines as a star of the first magnitude."[7]

[6] Francesco Petrarca (1304–1374). Petrarch is best known to most as the writer of Italian sonnets, but his significance for general history is due almost wholly to his relation to the revival of classical learning in Italy, and consequently it is only of this phase of his activity that we shall speak.

[7] Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums*, 3d ed., vol. i, p. 22.

It is in such words as these that one of the greatest historians of humanism speaks of Petrarch and his place in the history of the intellectual progress of the race. It will be worth our while to try to understand what Petrarch was in himself and what he did which justifies such an appraisement of his significance for universal history. A study of his life and work will be found to be a study of the essential qualities of the most important intellectual revolution through which the European peoples have ever passed. To understand Petrarch is to understand the Renaissance.

Petrarch was the first and greatest representative of the humanistic phase of the Italian Renaissance. He was the first scholar of the mediæval time who fully realized and appreciated the supreme excellence and beauty of the classical literature and its value as a means of culture. His enthusiasm for the ancient writers was a sort of worship. At great cost of time and labor he made a collection of about two hundred manuscript volumes of the classics. Among his choicest Latin treasures were some of Cicero's letters, which he had himself discovered in an old library at Verona, and reverently copied with his own hand. He could not read Greek, yet he gathered Greek as well as Latin manuscripts. He had sixteen works of Plato and a revered copy of Homer sent him from Constantinople; and thus, as he himself expressed it, the first of poets and the first of philosophers took up their abode with him.

This last sentiment reveals Petrarch's feeling for his books. The spirits of their authors seemed to him to surround him in his quiet library, and he was never so happy as when holding converse with these choice souls of the past. Often he wrote letters to the old worthies, — Homer, Cicero, Vergil, Seneca, and the rest, — for Petrarch loved thus to record his thoughts, and spent much of his time in the recreation of letter-writing; for recreation, and life itself, letter-writing was to him.

Petrarch's enthusiasm for the classical authors became

contagious. Fathers reproached him for enticing their sons from the study of the law to the reading of the classics and the writing of Latin verses. But the movement started by Petrarch could not be checked. The impulse he imparted to humanistic studies is still felt in the world of letters and learning.

291. Petrarch and the Schoolmen. — The new spirit awakened in Petrarch made him perforce the uncompromising critic and opponent of almost everything mediæval. For the Schoolmen he had a special aversion. He scoffed at them with their tiresome disputations, likening them to the ancient Sophists, men who played with words and forgot that their use is to express thought and to promote the cause of truth. The universities, which were their strongholds, he called "nests of the densest ignorance." The immense folios of the Scholastics he characterized as piles of rubbish with no grains of truth.

In order to confound his enemies when they quoted Aristotle against him, he declared that there were many things which Aristotle did not know, that he was only a man and hence liable to make mistakes. This was a bold word to utter then. It was almost as heretical as a denial of the infallibility of the Bible. "Such a word in the history of science," says Voigt, "makes an epoch such as a Battle of the Nations makes in the history of states. . . . The blow struck not Aristotle alone, but also the Church and the whole mediæval system." [8]

292. Petrarch's Feeling for the Ruins of Rome.[9] — Petrarch had for the material monuments of classical antiquity a feeling akin to that which he had for its literary memorials.

The men of the real mediæval time had no intelligent curiosity or feeling respecting the monuments and ruins of the

[8] *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums*, 3d ed., vol. i, p. 80.

[9] This subject may at first thought seem out of place here in connection with the humanistic movement, and appear to belong rather to the artistic revival; but it has really a less close relation to that phase of the Renaissance than to the one with which we are now dealing, for the reason that it was neither the technical nor the æsthetic element in the ancient monuments that appealed to Petrarch. His feeling for them was purely historical or sentimental.

ancient world. Their attitude towards all these things was exactly the same as that of the modern Arabs and Turks towards the remains of past civilizations in the lands of the Orient. To these degenerate successors of masterful races the ruins of Nineveh and Babylon are convenient and rich brick quarries, and nothing more. They are absolutely indifferent respecting all that great past to which these vast ruins bear silent and melancholy witness. How different is it with us, children of the Renaissance, as we dig in those same mounds, carefully and reverently gathering up every fragment of lettered stone or brick that may tell us something of the thoughts and feelings and deeds of those men of the early time!

All this illustrates perfectly the difference between the mediæval man and the man of the Renaissance. During all the mediæval centuries, until the dawn of the intellectual revival, the ruins of Rome were merely a quarry. The monuments of the Cæsars were torn down for building material, the sculptured marbles were burned into lime for mortar. Whatever memorials of the past exist in Rome to-day are merely the leavings of centuries of ignorant, ruthless spoliation.[10]

Now Petrarch was one of the first men of mediæval times who had for the ruins of Rome the modern feeling. "He tells us how often with Giovanni Colonna he ascended the mighty vaults of the Baths of Diocletian, and there in the transparent air, amid the wide silence, with the broad panorama stretching far around them, they spoke, not of business, or political

[10] The way in which Brunelleschi and Donatello were regarded when at the opening of the fifteenth century they visited Rome in order to study the old monuments is a good illustration of the entire lack of feeling, either artistic or sentimental, in the Romans of that day for the ruins of the ancient city. After telling how the artists enthusiastically examined and measured the fragments of antique capitals, cornices, and walls, and employed laborers to lay bare the buried foundations of old buildings, Vasari adds: "Reports of this being spread about Rome, the artists were called treasure-seekers, . . . the people believing them to be men who studied geomancy, for the discovery of treasures." That the artists could have any other object among the ruins was wholly inconceivable to the native Romans.

affairs, but of the history which the ruins beneath their feet suggested." [11]

293. Boccaccio, the Disciple of Petrarch. — Petrarch called into existence a school of ardent young humanists who looked up to him as their master, and who carried on with unbounded enthusiasm the work of exploring and exploiting the new spiritual hemisphere which he had discovered. Most distinguished among these disciples was Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–1375), whose wide fame rests chiefly on his *Decameron*, a collection of tales written in Italian, but whose work as a humanist alone has interest for us in the present connection.

Boccaccio did much to spread and to deepen the enthusiasm for antiquity that Petrarch had awakened. He industriously collected and copied ancient manuscripts and thus greatly promoted classical scholarship in Italy. Imitating Petrarch, he tried to learn Greek, but, like Petrarch, made very little progress towards the mastery of the language because of the incompetence of his teacher and also because of the utter lack of text-books, grammars, and dictionaries. He persuaded his teacher, however, to make a Latin translation of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and was thus instrumental in giving to the world the first modern translation of Homer. It was a wretched version, yet it served to inspire in the Italian scholars an intense desire to know at first hand Greek literature, — that literature from which the old Roman authors had admittedly drawn their inspiration.

[11] Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, p. 177. Petrarch represents still other phases and qualities of the modern spirit, upon which, however, it is impossible for us to dwell. Regarding his feeling for nature in her grand and romantic aspects, we must nevertheless say a single word. One of the most remarkable passages in his writings is his description of his ascent of Mount Ventoux, near Avignon, for the sake of the view from the top. This was the beginning of the mountain climbing of modern times, — a new thing in the world. There was very little of it in antiquity, and during the Middle Ages apparently none at all. Even Dante always speaks of the mountains with a shudder. Nothing distinguishes the modern from the mediæval man more sharply than this new feeling for nature in her wilder and grander moods.

294. The Italians are taught Greek by Chrysoloras. — This desire of the Italian scholars was soon gratified. Just at the close of the fourteenth century the Eastern emperor sent an embassy to Italy to beg aid against the Turks. The commission was headed by Manuel Chrysoloras, an eminent Greek scholar. No sooner had he landed at Venice than the Florentines sent him a pressing invitation to come to their city. He acceded to their request, was received by them with such honor as they might have shown a celestial being, and was given a professor's chair in their university (1396). Young and old thronged his class room. Men past sixty "felt the blood leap in their veins" at the thought of being able to learn Greek.

The appearance of Chrysoloras as a teacher at Florence marks the revival, after seven centuries of neglect, of the study of the Greek language and literature in the schools of Western Europe. This meant much: it meant the revival of civilization, the opening of the modern age; for, of all the agencies concerned in transforming the mediæval into the modern world, one of the most potent certainly was Greek culture.[12]

295. The Search for Old Manuscripts. — Having now spoken of the pioneers of Italian humanism in the fourteenth century, we can, in our remaining space, touch only in a very general way upon the most important phases of the humanistic movement in the following century.

The first concern of the Italian scholars was to rescue from threatened oblivion what yet remained of the ancient classics. Just as the antiquarians of to-day dig over the mounds of Assyria for relics of the ancient civilization of the East, so did the humanists ransack the libraries of the monasteries and cathedrals and search through all the out-of-the-way places of Europe for old manuscripts of the classic writers.

[12] "If it be true [as has been asserted] that except the blind forces of nature nothing moves in this world which is not Greek in its origin, we are justified in regarding the point of contact between the Greek teacher Chrysoloras and his Florentine pupils as one of the most momentous crises in the history of civilization." — SYMONDS, *The Revival of Learning*, p. 113.

Symonds likens these enthusiasts to new crusaders: "As the Franks," he says, "deemed themselves thrice blest if they returned with relics from Jerusalem, so these new Knights of the Holy Ghost, seeking not the sepulcher of a risen Lord, but the tomb wherein the genius of the ancient world awaited resurrection, felt holy transport when a brown, begrimed, and crabbed scrap of some Greek or Latin author rewarded their patient search."

The precious manuscripts were often discovered in a shameful state of neglect and in advanced stages of decay. Sometimes they were found covered with mould in damp cells or loaded with dust in the attics of monasteries. Again they were discovered, as by Boccaccio in the manuscript-room of the Benedictine monastery of Monte Cassino, mutilated in various ways, some, for instance, with the borders of the parchment pared away, and others with whole leaves lacking.[13]

Petrarch, as we have already seen, was the first and most enthusiastic searcher for these ancient treasures. After him, Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1459), one of the most noted of the scholars of the Italian Renaissance, is best entitled to remembrance. He recovered the poem of Lucretius, several of the orations of Cicero, and other classics. One of his most highly prized finds was a copy of the *Institutes* of Quintilian, which he unearthed in the library of the monastery of Saint Gall in Switzerland. For this happy discovery a contemporary declared him worthy to be called the "Second Founder of Rome."

This late search of the humanists for the works of the ancient authors saved to the world many precious manuscripts which, a little longer neglected, would have been forever lost.

[13] This mutilation was due chiefly to the scarcity of writing material, which led the mediæval copyists to erase the original text of old parchments that they might use them a second time. In this way many works of the classical authors were destroyed. Sometimes, however, the earlier text was so imperfectly obliterated that by means of chemical reagents it can be wholly or partially restored. But the humanists were ignorant of the value of these palimpsests, as such twice-written manuscripts are called, and hence made no search for them.

296. Patrons of the New Learning; the Founding of Libraries. — This gathering and copying of the ancient manuscripts was costly in time and labor. But there was many a Mæcenas to encourage and further the work. Merchant princes, despots, and popes became generous patrons of the humanists. Prominent among these promoters of the New Learning, as it was called, were Cosimo and Lorenzo de' Medici at Florence. It was largely due to their genuine and enlightened interest in the great undertaking of recovering for culture the ancient classical literatures that Florence became the foster home of the intellectual and literary revival.

Among the papal promoters of the movement Pope Nicholas V (1447–1455) was one of the most noted. He sent out explorers to all parts of the West to search for manuscripts, and kept busy at Rome a multitude of copyists and translators. A little later, Pope Julius II (1503–1513) and Pope Leo X (1513–1521) made Rome a brilliant center of Renaissance art and learning.

Libraries were founded where the new treasures might be safely stored and made accessible to scholars. In this movement some of the largest libraries of Italy had their beginnings. At Florence the Medici established the fine existing Medicean Library. At Rome Pope Nicholas V enriched the original papal collection of books by the addition, it is said, of fully five thousand manuscripts, and thus became the real founder of the celebrated Vatican Library of the present day.

297. How the Fall of Constantinople aided the Revival. — The humanistic movement, especially in so far as it concerned Greek letters and learning, was given a great impulse by the disasters which in the fifteenth century befell the Eastern empire. Constantinople, it will be recalled, was captured by the Ottoman Turks in 1453. But for a half century before that event the threatening advance of the barbarians had caused a great migration of Greek scholars to the West. So many of the exiles sought an asylum in Italy that one could

say: "Greece has not fallen: she has migrated to Italy, which in ancient times bore the name of Magna Græcia."

These fugitives brought with them many valuable manuscripts of the ancient Greek classics still unknown to Western scholars. The enthusiasm of the Italians for everything Greek led to the appointment of many of the exiles as teachers and lecturers in their schools and universities. Thus, there was now a repetition of what took place at Rome in the days of the later republic; Italy was conquered a second time by the genius of Greece.

298. Translation and Criticism of the Classics; the Upspringing of Academies.—The recovery of the ancient classics, their multiplication by copyists, and their preservation in libraries was only the first and lightest part of the task which the Italian humanists set themselves. The most difficult and significant part of their work lay in the comparison and correction of texts, the translation into Latin of the Greek manuscripts, and the interpretation, valuation, and criticism of the ancient literatures now recovered.

Among the Italian scholars who devoted themselves to this work a foremost place must be assigned to Angelo Poliziano, or Politian (1454–1494), a man of remarkable genius and learning. Erasmus, the celebrated Dutch humanist, characterized him as a "rare miracle of nature." As a teacher of Greek and Latin at Florence he exerted a vast influence in the diffusion of the New Learning. Almost all the noted humanists in Europe of his own and the following generation seem to have caught their inspiration in his lecture room.

Another name of great renown connected with these fifteenth-century labors of the Italian scholars is that of Pico della Mirandola (1463–1494), a man of extraordinary gifts of mind. The special task which Pico set for himself was the harmonizing of Christianity and the New Learning, a task like that of those scholars of the present time who seek to reconcile

the Bible and modern science. His work was cut short by a premature death.[14]

A word will here be in place respecting the academies or associations of scholars which, during the fifteenth century, were formed in all the cities of Italy. These circles included in their membership all the most eminent men of letters in the peninsula. They may be regarded as the prototypes of the learned literary and scientific societies of the present time. The most celebrated was the Platonic Academy at Florence, founded and fostered by the Medici. Plato was the patron saint of these Florentine academicians. His birthday was religiously celebrated, his bust was crowned with laurel, and a lamp was kept burning before his statue, — all of which reveals better than words the ardor of the passion for the ancient culture which had come to possess the Italian scholars.

299. The Invention of Printing; the Aldine Press at Venice. — During the latter part of the fifteenth century the work of the Italian humanists was greatly furthered by the happy and timely invention of the art of printing from movable letters, the most important discovery, in the estimation of Hallam, recorded in the annals of mankind.

The making of impressions by means of engraved seals or blocks seems to be a device as old as civilization. The Chinese have practiced this form of printing from an early time. Chaldæan seals have been found in large numbers, and the old Babylonian mounds are full of bricks *stamped* with the name and title of their ancient builders.

The art seems to have sprung up anew in Europe during the later mediæval period. First, devices on playing cards were formed by impressions from blocks; then manuscripts

[14] Still another Italian scholar who gained great distinction in the new field of literary and historical criticism was Laurentius Valla, but of him we *shall find it* more convenient to speak a little farther on in another connection *(par. 308)*.

were stamped with portraits and pictures. The next step was to cut into the same block a few lines of explanatory text, — and we can readily believe that some of the first efforts at wood carving needed explanation. The progress of the art through these initial stages is illustrated by old manuscripts still in existence. In time the lines increased to pages, and during the first half of the fifteenth century many entire books were produced by the block-printing method.

But printing from blocks was slow and costly. The art was revolutionized by John Gutenberg (1400–1468), a native of Mainz in Germany, through the invention of the movable letters which we call type.[15]

The oldest book known to have been printed from movable letters was a Latin copy of the Bible issued from the press of Gutenberg and Faust at Mainz between the years 1454 and

[15] Some Dutch writers claim that the honor of the invention belongs to Coster of Haarlem, but there is nothing aside from unreliable tradition on which such a claim can rest. It should be noted that the essence of the invention consisted less in the movableness of the type than in the fact that they were *cast* in a mould, and thus made so exactly of the same size that they could be grouped and regrouped at will without irregularity or falling apart.

The account given by Dr. Martin in his recent work on *The Lore of Cathay* (p. 27) of the invention of printing by the Chinese possesses such a special interest that we reproduce it here in full: "For seven hundred years [before Gutenberg's invention] the art had been practiced in China, not in secret as he and Faustus practiced it, but as a great popular industry. Its origin is remarkable. A tyrant, determined to uproot the principles of Confucius, burned the books of the Sage. They were restored partly from memory, partly from imperfect copies found hidden in the wall of a house. The Emperor Tai Tsung (A.D. 627), resolved that the sacred inheritance should never again be exposed to destruction by fire, caused the books to be engraved on stone. That stone library is still extant. A hundred and seventy slabs of granite bearing on their faces the text of the thirteen classics may still be seen at Hsi An Fu, and a modern imitation of it stands in the old Confucian University at Peking. No sooner was that Imperial edition completed than the idea occurred of making it accessible to scholars in all parts of the country by means of rubbings. That was printing. Nor in China has the form of that art greatly changed in the lapse of a thousand years. . . . From the invention of block printing it was not long until attempts were made to print with divisible type, but they failed to supersede the primitive method, the Chinese not having hit on that happy alloy known as 'printers' metal.'"

1456. The art spread rapidly, its dissemination having been aided by the sack of Mainz in 1462, which scattered abroad the printers of the city, and before the close of the fifteenth century presses were busy in every country of Europe — in the city of Venice alone there were two hundred — multiplying books with a rapidity undreamed of by the patient copyists of the cloister.

But it is merely the introduction of the new art into Italy that especially concerns us now. The little that our brief space will permit us to say on this subject gathers about the name of Aldus Manutius (1450–1515), who established at Venice a celebrated printing-house, known as the Aldine Press, the story of which forms one of the earliest and most interesting chapters in the history of the new art in its relation to humanism.

The aim of Aldus was to make accessible to all scholars the texts of the ancient classics, especially those of the Greek authors. He was aided and encouraged in his work by Greek scholars in all parts of Europe. Erasmus worked for some time in his household as editor of Greek texts. The scholars whom Aldus thus gathered about him in his work formed a coterie known as the Aldine Academy of Hellenists, to which no one was admitted who could not speak Greek.

In the course of a few years Aldus had given to the appreciative scholars of Europe an almost complete series of the Greek authors. Besides these Greek editions he issued both Latin and Hebrew texts. Altogether he printed over a hundred works. In quality of paper and in clearness and beauty of type his editions have never been surpassed.

The work of the Aldine Press at Venice, in connection of course with what was done by presses of less note in other places, made complete the recovery of the classical literatures, and by scattering broadcast throughout Europe the works of the ancient authors rendered it impossible that any part of *them should* ever again become lost to the world.

300. Humanism crosses the Alps. — Just at the close of the mediæval and the opening of the modern period Italy became the object of French and Spanish royal ambitions, and was desolated by contentions and wars which proved very disastrous there to the cause of the humanists, already showing signs of decline. During the sixteenth century, under other blighting influences which we shall notice when we come to speak of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation, the study of Greek ceased almost entirely in the schools of the peninsula. But already the humanistic enthusiasm had infected the countries beyond the Alps, and as the zeal of the scholars of the South died away that of the scholars of the North created a home for the New Learning in the schools and universities of Germany, France, and England.

Already, about the middle of the fifteenth century, the German youths had begun to cross the Alps in order to study Greek at the feet of the masters there. As the type and representative of these young German humanists we may name Reuchlin, who in 1482 journeyed to Italy and presented himself there before a celebrated teacher of Greek. As a test of his knowledge of the language he was given to translate a passage from Thucydides. The young barbarian — for by this term the Italians of that time expressed their contempt for an inhabitant of the rude North — turned the lines so easily and masterfully that the examiner, who was a native-born Greek, cried out in astonishment, "Our exiled Greece has flown beyond the Alps."

In transalpine Europe the humanistic movement became blended with other tendencies. In Italy it had been an almost exclusive devotion to Greek and Latin letters and learning; but in the North there was added to this enthusiasm for classical culture an equal and indeed supreme interest in Hebrew and Christian antiquity. Hence here the literary and intellectual revival became, in the profoundest

sense, the moving cause of the great religious revolution known as the Reformation, and it is in connection with the beginnings of that movement that we shall find a place to speak of the humanists of Germany and the other northern lands.

301. The Artistic Revival. — As we have already seen, the new feeling for classical antiquity awakened among the Italians embraced not simply the literary and philosophical side of the Græco-Roman culture, but the artistic side as well. Respecting this latter phase of the Italian Renaissance it will be impossible for us to speak in detail, nor is it necessary for us to do so, since the chief significance of the Renaissance for universal history, as already noted, is to be sought in the purely intellectual movement traced in the preceding pages of this chapter.

The artistic revival was in its essence a return of art to nature; for mediæval art lacked freedom and naturalness.[16] The artist was hampered by ecclesiastical tradition and restraint; he was, moreover, under the influence of the religious asceticism of the time. His models as a rule were the stiff, angular, lifeless forms of Byzantine art, or the gaunt, pinched

[16] Mediæval architecture escapes this censure. Its forms never lost vitality or the power of growth and adaptation. Many styles of architecture strove together for ascendency during the mediæval time. In Italy there were five chief types, — the Byzantine, the Lombard, the Saracenic, the Gothic, and the Romanesque. Up to the period of the Renaissance it was the Romanesque style, that is, a style whose leading characteristics were derived from the old Roman architecture, which was the one preferred by the Italian builders. What took place under the influence of the new enthusiasm for antiquity was a more conscious and exact reproduction of Roman forms as these had been preserved in the ruins scattered throughout the peninsula. Among the great architects of the Italian Renaissance the following names hold a preëminent place: Brunelleschi (1377–1444), who, with the Pantheon at Rome as his model, raised the great dome of the cathedral at Florence, one of the largest and most beautiful in the world; Leo Battista Alberti (1405–1472), who designed the celebrated church of Saint Francis at Rimini; Bramante (1444–1514), the first architect of Saint Peter's at Rome; and Michael Angelo (1475–1564), who planned the majestic dome of Saint Peter's, his masterpiece and also the masterpiece of Renaissance architecture.

bodies of saints and anchorites. In the decoration of the walls, pulpits, and altars of the churches he was not at liberty, even if he had the impulse, to depart from the consecrated traditional types.[17]

Now what the Renaissance did for art was to liberate it from these trammels and to breathe into its dead forms the spirit of that new life which was everywhere awakening. This emancipation movement took place under impulses which came both from the side of nature and from the side of antiquity, that is, from the study of nature's living forms and from a study of the masterpieces of ancient art.[18]

But in the field of Renaissance art, as in the field of Renaissance letters, genius played an important part. Just as the humanistic revival had its true beginnings with a great personality, so was it with the artistic revival. In the same sense that Petrarch was, as he has been called, "the father of humanism," was Niccola Pisano (died 1278) the father of Renaissance sculpture. As Petrarch caught his inspiration from contact with the ancient classics, so was the genius of Niccola fired by contact with the masterpieces of the ancient artists. It was in the carvings of old sarcophagi and the paintings on antique vases that he found his models. Thus did classical antiquity exercise the same influence in the emancipation and revival of art as in the emancipation and revival of letters.[19]

[17] In the Greek Church at the present time the artist in the portrayal of sacred subjects is not permitted to change the traditional expression or attitude of his figures.

[18] Renaissance painting, however, owed less to ancient art than did sculpture, for the reason that there were remaining very few specimens of classical painting. Hence, though the influence which ancient art exerted upon the Renaissance painters was strong, it was indirect.

[19] Brunelleschi holds the same relation to Renaissance architecture that Niccola holds to Renaissance sculpture. Of him Vasari has this to say: "We may truly declare him to have been given to us by heaven for the purpose of imparting a new spirit to architecture."

The new movement in art which began with Niccola Pisano found expression not only in sculpture [20] but also in painting.[21] To follow the developments in these fields would carry us far beyond the limits of our work. To what has already been said we shall add only a few words as to the place held by painting in Renaissance art.

302. Why Painting was the Supreme Art of the Italian Renaissance.[22] — The characteristic art of the Italian Renaissance was painting, and for the reason that it best expresses the ideas and sentiments of Christianity. The art that would be the handmaid of the Church needed to be able to represent faith and hope, ecstasy and suffering, — none of which things can well be expressed by sculpture, which is essentially the art of repose.

Sculpture was the chief art of the Greeks, because among them the aim of the artist was to represent physical beauty or strength. But the problem of the Christian artist is to express spiritual emotion or feeling through the medium of the body. This cannot be represented in cold, colorless marble. Thus, as Symonds asks, "How could the Last Judgment be expressed in plastic form?" The chief events of Christ's life removed him beyond the reach of sculpture.

Therefore, because sculpture has so little power to express emotion, painting, which runs so easily the entire gamut of

[20] In the long list of Italian sculptors which begins with Niccola Pisano, the following names are especially noteworthy: Ghiberti (1378–1455), whose genius is shown in his celebrated bronze gates of the Baptistery at Florence, of which Michael Angelo said that they were worthy to be the gates of Paradise; Brunelleschi (1377–1444), Donatello (1386–1466), and Michael Angelo (1475–1564).

[21] By some, Cimabue (about 1240–1302) is made the pioneer of Renaissance painting, but by most this honor is conceded to his pupil Giotto (1276–1377). Vasari says: "Although Cimabue may be considered perhaps the first cause of the restoration of the art of painting, yet Giotto, his disciple, . . . was the man who, attaining to superior elevation of thought, threw open the gates of the true way to those who afterwards exalted the art to that perfection and greatness which it displays in our age."

[22] The views presented in this paragraph are those of Symonds in his work on *The Fine Arts*, which forms the third volume of his *Renaissance in Italy*.

feeling, became the chosen medium of expression of the Italian artist. This art alone enabled him to portray the raptures of the saint, the sweet charm of the Madonna, the intense passion of the Christ, the moving terrors of the Last Judgment.

The four supreme masters of Italian Renaissance painting were Leonardo da Vinci[23] (1452–1519), whose masterpiece is his *Last Supper*, on the wall of a convent at Milan; Raphael (1483–1520), the best beloved of artists, whose Madonnas are counted among the world's treasures; Michael Angelo[24] (1475–1564), whose best paintings are his wonderful frescoes, among them the *Last Judgment*, in the Sistine Chapel at Rome; and Titian[25] (1477–1576), the Venetian master, celebrated for his portraits, which have preserved for us in flesh and blood, so to speak, many of the most noteworthy personages of his time.

The earlier Italian painters drew their subjects chiefly from Christian sources. They literally covered the walls of the churches, palaces, and civic buildings of Italy with pictorial representations of all the ideas and imaginings of the mediæval ages respecting death, the judgment, heaven, and hell. As Symonds tersely expresses it, they did by means of pictures what Dante had done by means of poetry.

The later artists, more under the influence of the classical revival, mingled freely pagan and Christian subjects and motives,

[23] Leonardo da Vinci was, in his manysidedness and versatility, a true child of the Italian Renaissance: he was at once painter, sculptor, architect, poet, musician, and scientist.

[24] Michael Angelo, as we have seen, was an architect and sculptor as well as a painter. He is the only modern sculptor who can be given a place alongside the greatest sculptors of ancient Greece. He forced sculpture to do what it is not wont to do, — to use the emotional language of painting; that is, he cut in marble thoughts and feelings that less masterful genius than his must needs express by means of painting.

[25] A longer list of the most eminent Italian painters would include at least the following names: Cimabue (about 1240–1302) and Giotto (1276–1337), precursors of the revival; Fra Angelico (1387–1455); Correggio (about 1494–1534); Tintoretto (1518–1594); and Veronese (about 1530–1588), representatives of the Renaissance proper.

and thus became truer representatives than their predecessors of the Renaissance movement, one important issue of which was to be the reconciliation and blending of pagan and Christian culture.

303. **The Paganism of the Italian Renaissance.**—There was a religious and moral, or, as usually expressed, an irreligious and immoral, side to the classical revival in Italy which cannot be passed wholly unnoticed even in so brief an account of the movement as the present sketch.

In the first place the study of the pagan poets and philosophers produced the exact result predicted by a certain party in the Church. It proved hurtful to religious faith. Men became pagans in their feelings and in their way of thinking.

This paganization of Italian society began in the thirteenth century with that intellectual revival which brought into Christian Europe Græco-Arabian science and speculation. Even in Petrarch's time skepticism in university circles was widespread. To him the world seemed so desperately wicked in unbelief that he could hardly bring himself to regret its depopulation by the awful plague which swept away such multitudes in his day. When, in the next century, the Italians came more completely under the influence of the classical revival, this decay of religious faith became still more marked, until Italian scholars and Italian society almost ceased to be Christian in any true sense of the word.

With the New Learning came also those vices and immoralities that characterized the decline of classical civilization. Italy was corrupted by the new influences that flowed in upon her, just as Rome was corrupted by Grecian luxury and sensuality in the days of the failing republic. Christian moral ideals were displaced by the moral standards of pagan antiquity; Christian asceticism, restraint, and discipline were held up to ridicule, and the old pagan vices were applauded and adopted. Much of the literature of the time is even more grossly immoral *in tone than the* literature of the age of classical decadence.

It was this moral debasement of Italian society which did much to pave the way for that political humiliation of Italy of which we shall soon be witnesses.

III. General Effects of the Renaissance

304. The Renaissance brought in New Conceptions of Life and the World. — The Renaissance effected in the Christian West an intellectual and moral revolution so profound and so far-reaching in its consequences that it may well be likened to that produced in the ancient world by the incoming of Christianity. Into the world of mediæval illusions and ideals it brought conceptions of man and of the universe as much opposed to the prevailing views as the teachings of the first preachers of the Cross were opposed to all the conceptions, prejudices, and moral standards of the pagan world of antiquity. The New Learning was indeed a New Gospel. "Its mission," in the words of Bishop Creighton, "was to carry throughout Europe a new culture."

Like Christianity, the Renaissance revealed to men another world, another state of existence; for such was the real significance, to the men of the revival, of the discovery of the civilization of classical antiquity. Through this discovery they came to know themselves. They learned the real nature and dignity of man.[26] They learned that this earthly life is worth living for its own sake; that this life and its pleasures need not be contemned and sacrificed in order to make sure of eternal life in another world; and that man may think and investigate and satisfy his thirst to know without endangering the welfare of his soul.[27]

[26] Under the inspiration of the Renaissance the humanist Pico della Mirandola wrote a celebrated treatise entitled *The Dignity of Human Nature and the Greatness of Man.*

[27] The longings and the superstitious fears of men in the age of transition between mediæval and modern times is well epitomized in the tradition of Dr. Faustus. "That legend," says Symonds, "tells us what the men upon the eve

These discoveries made by the men of the Renaissance gave a vast impulse to the progress of the human race. They inspired humanity with a new spirit, a spirit destined in time to make things new in all realms — in the realm of religion, of politics, of literature, of art, of science, of invention, of industry.

Some of these changes and revolutions we shall briefly indicate in the remaining paragraphs of this chapter. To follow them out more in detail in all the territories of human activity and achievement will be our aim in another volume where we propose to trace the course of the historical development through the centuries of the Modern Age — the great age opened by the Renaissance.

305. It restored the Broken Unity of History. — When Christianity entered the ancient Græco-Roman world war declared itself at once between the new religion and classical culture, especially between it and Hellenism. The Church, soon triumphant over paganism, rejected the bequest of antiquity. Some of the elements of that heritage were, it is true, appropriated by the men of the mediæval time and thus came to enrich the new Christian culture; but, as a whole, it was cast aside and neglected. Thus was the unity of the historical development interrupted.

Now through the liberal tendencies and generous enthusiasms of the Renaissance there was effected a reconciliation

of the Revival longed for, and what they dreaded, when they turned their minds toward the past. The secret of enjoyment and the source of strength possessed by the ancients allured them; but they believed that they could only recover this lost treasure by the suicide of the soul. So great was the temptation, that Faustus paid the price. After imbibing all the knowledge of the age, he sold himself to the devil, in order that his thirst for experience might be quenched, his grasp upon the world be strengthened, and the ennui of his activity be soothed. His first use of this dearly-bought power was to make blind Homer sing to him. Amphion tunes his harp in concert with Mephistopheles. Alexander rises from the dead at his behest, with all his legionaries; and Helen is given to him for a bride. Faustus is therefore a parable of the impotent yearnings of the spirit in the Middle Ages, — its passionate aspiration, its conscience-stricken desire, its fettered curiosity amid the cramping limits of impotent knowledge and irrational *dogmatisms."* — *Revival of Learning*, p. 53 (ed. 1888).

between Christianity and classical civilization. There took place a fusion of their qualities and elements. The broken unity of history was restored. The cleft between the ancient and the modern world was closed. The severed branch was reunited to the old trunk.

The importance for universal history of this restoration of its broken unity, of this recovery by the Modern Age of the long-neglected culture of antiquity, can hardly be overestimated; for that culture had in its keeping not only the best the human race had thought and felt in the period of the highest reach of its powers, but also the precious scientific stores accumulated by all the ancient peoples. What the recovery and appropriation of all this meant for the world is suggested by ex-President Wolsey in these words: "The old civilization contained treasures of permanent value which the world could not spare, which the world will never be able or willing to spare. These were taken up into the stream of life, and proved true aids to the progress of a culture which is gathering in one the beauty and truth of all the ages."

306. It reformed Education. — The humanistic revival revolutionized education. During the Middle Ages the Latin language had degenerated, for the most part, into a barbarous jargon, while the Greek had been forgotten and the Aristotelian philosophy perverted. As to Plato, he was practically unknown to the mediæval thinkers.

Now humanism restored to the world the pure classical Latin, rediscovered the Greek language, and recovered for civilization the once-rejected heritage of the ancient classics, including the Platonic philosophy, which was to be a quickening and uplifting force in modern thought.

The schools and universities did not escape the influences of this humanistic revival. Chairs in both the Greek and Latin languages and literatures were now established, not only in the new universities which arose under the inspiration of the New Learning, but also in the old ones. The scholastic method

of instruction, of which we spoke in a preceding chapter, was gradually superseded by this so-called classical system of education, which dominated the schools and universities of the world down to the incoming of the scientific studies of the present day. Even yet it holds a prominent place in most of our schemes of study, too prominent a place according to many educators, who complain that Greek and Latin absorb time of the student which should be given to the sciences and to modern languages and literatures.

307. It aided the Development of the Vernacular Literatures. — The classical revival gave to the world the treasures of two great literatures. And in giving to the scholars of Europe the masterpieces of the ancient authors, it gave to them, besides much fresh material, the most faultless models of literary taste and judgment that the world has ever produced. The influence of these in correcting the extravagances of the mediæval imagination and in creating correct literary ideals can be distinctly traced in the native literatures of Italy, France, Spain, England, and Germany.

It is sometimes maintained indeed that the attention given to the ancient classics, and the preferred use by so many authors during the later mediæval and the earlier modern period of the Latin as a literary language,[28] retarded the normal development of the vernacular literatures of the European peoples. As to Italy, it is true that the national literature which had started into life with such promise with Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio was for almost a century neglected; but in transalpine Europe, apart from Germany, where for a period Latin did almost supplant the vernacular, the revived study of the classics did not produce the disastrous effects observed in Italy. On the contrary, as we have just said, the effects of humanism upon the great literatures of Europe, aside from the exceptions noticed, was to enrich, to chasten, and to refine them.

[28] Some of the very best literary work of the period was done in Latin, as witness the *Colloquies* by Erasmus and the Utopia by More.

308. It called into Existence the Sciences of Archæology and Historical Criticism. — Many sciences were in germ in the Renaissance. As to the science of archæology, which possesses such a special interest for the historical student, it may be truly said that it had its birth in the classical revival. We have already noticed the new feeling for the remains of antiquity that stirred in the souls of the men of the Renaissance (par. 292).

The ruins of Rome were naturally the first object of the reverent curiosity and archæological zeal of the Italian scholars. Towards the close of the fifteenth century Flavio Biondo wrote, besides other works on the antiquities of Italy, his *Rome Restored*, the first scientific treatise on archæology.[29] From that time down to the present day the interest in the monuments and relics of past ages and civilizations has steadily widened and deepened and has led to remarkable discoveries, not only on classical ground, but also in Hebrew, Assyrian, and Egyptian territories, — discoveries which, by carrying the story of the human race back into a past immensely remote, have given an entirely new beginning to history.

What is true of the science of archæology is equally true of the science of historical criticism. We have seen that the spirit which awoke in the Renaissance was a questioning, critical spirit, one very different from the credulous mediæval spirit, which was ready to accept any picturesque tradition or marvelous tale without inquiry as to its source or credibility. It was this spirit that stirred in Petrarch. We find him comparing and criticising the classical authors and following only those whom he has reason to believe to be trustworthy.

But the true founder of the science of historical criticism was Laurentius Valla (1407–1457). His greatest achievement as a critic was the demonstration, on philological and historical

[29] There were earlier works on the ruins of Rome, notably one by Rienzi, entitled *Description of the City of Rome and its Splendor*, but they lacked the scientific character of Biondo's.

grounds, of the unauthentic character of the celebrated Donation of Constantine[30] (par. 139). He also called in question the authority of Livy and proved the spurious character of the alleged correspondence between Seneca and the Apostle Paul.

The achievements of Valla ushered in the day of historical criticism. Here began that critical sifting and valuation of our historical sources which has resulted in the discrediting of a thousand myths and legends once regarded as unimpeachable historical material, and in the consequent reconstruction of Oriental, classical, and mediæval history.

The same influences that created these two sciences also gave birth to true history writing. It was in Florence, the intellectual center of the Italian Renaissance, that appeared a group of writers, chief among whom were Machiavelli and Guicciardini,[31] who, because of their critical spirit and sane impartial judgment, as well as on account of their excellencies of style, deserve, in contrast with the dull, uncritical mediæval chroniclers and annalists, to be looked upon as the first modern historians.

309. It gave an Impulse to Religious Reform. — The humanistic movement, as we have already noticed, when it crossed the Alps assumed among the northern peoples a new character. It was the Hebrew past rather than the Græco-Roman past which stirred the interest of the scholars of the North. The Bible, which the printing presses were now multiplying in the original Hebrew and Greek as well as in the vernacular languages, became the subject of enthusiastic study and of fresh interpretation.

[30] This document had been attacked before, but generally those doing so had not the classical scholarship required to show clearly its real character. An attack, however, by the English scholar, Bishop Reginald Pecock (about 1390–1460), was marked by sound learning and scientific method of investigation; but Pecock, not being so widely known as Valla, his assault had much less influence than that of the latter.

[31] Nicholas Machiavelli (1469–1527) wrote in a remarkably clear, vivid style a *History of Florence;* Francesco Guicciardini (1482–1540) wrote a *History of Italy from 1494 to 1532.*

Consequently what was in the South a restoration of classical literature and art became in the more serious and less sensuous North a revival of primitive Christianity, of the ethical and religious elements of the Hebrew-Christian past. The humanist became the reformer. "The truth is," says Symonds, "that the Reformation was the Teutonic Renaissance."

There were certain principles and qualities in humanism which made inevitable this transformation of the revival in its passage from the South to the North. In the first place, the principle of free inquiry in humanism was bound to come into collision with the principle of ecclesiastical authority. It was this tendency in humanism which at last awakened the fears of the papal court and set it in opposition to the entire intellectual movement of which in its earlier stages it had been a most zealous promoter.

In the second place, there was in the humanists a spirit of self-reliance in religious matters which was a foreshadowing of the coming individualism of the Reformation. Writing to his brother, who in his letters was accustomed to make many citations from the Church Fathers, Petrarch says: "You would do well to trust, for a time at least, more to your own powers, nor be afraid that the same spirit which made the Fathers wise will not aid you." [82] This is a note of the Protestant Revolution.

In the third place, there was a rebellious spirit in humanism, a spirit of protest not only against mediæval theology but against the whole mediæval system. Humanism, like primitive Christianity, was instinct with revolutionary forces calculated to turn the world upside down. The humanists of the North — Reuchlin, Erasmus, and the rest — were the true precursors of the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century.

Sources and Source Material. — Robinson and Rolfe's *Petrarch: The First Modern Scholar and Man of Letters.* This volume contains a selection from Petrarch's "correspondence with Boccaccio and other

[82] Translated by James Harvey Robinson in his *Petrarch*, p. 401.

friends, designed to illustrate the beginnings of the Renaissance." The student should begin his readings on this subject with this delightful book. The letters are admirably translated, while the biographical and explanatory notes are full and scholarly. Whitcomb's *Source-Book of the Renaissance*, Part I. An excellent little book, which forms a good supplement to the preceding work. The part cited contains short extracts judiciously chosen from the writings of fourteen Italian writers of the age of the Renaissance. These selections cover a wide field, the first being taken from Dante's writings and the last from Cellini's autobiography. Colby's *Selections from the Sources of English History*, Extract 52, "The Revival of Learning in England." DANTE, *Divina Commedia* (trans. by Longfellow). MACHIAVELLI, *The Prince* (ed. by Morley). We have here a reflection of the political morality of the age of the Renaissance in Italy. BENVENUTO CELLINI, *Memoirs*. Roscoe's version, in the Bohn Library, should be used. (There is a more recent translation than this, but for the reason that it reproduces with such sedulous fidelity all the pagan frankness of the original, we cannot recommend teachers to put it in the hands of young readers.) Cellini was the embodiment of the most diverse phases of the revival in Italy. His character was a most extraordinary combination of the Bohemian artist and the desperate ruffian. Of his autobiography Symonds says: "From the pages of this book the Genius of the Renaissance, incarnate in a single personality, leans forth and speaks to us." VASARI (GIORGIO), *Lives of Seventy of the most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*, 4 vols. (edited and annotated in the light of recent discoveries by E. H. and E. W. Blashfield and A. A. Hopkins). The editors have used the translation by Mrs. Foster. Only the best and most important of Vasari's "Lives" are given. Vasari (1511–1574) was himself an artist and the contemporary of the greatest masters of the Italian Renaissance. His work, which was first published in 1550, is charmingly written and is a great storehouse of material for the art history of the Renaissance; but it must, of course, be read in the light of later criticism and research. *The Book of The Courtier, from the Italian of Count Baldassare Castiglione: done into English by Sir Thomas Hoby, anno 1561. With an Introduction by Walter Raleigh* (The Tudor Translations, London, 1900). This book is one of the most important and characteristic products of the Italian Renaissance. It reveals the better moral side of the revival, just as Machiavelli's *The Prince* discloses its worst moral phase. It holds up an ideal like that of chivalry (par. 163), but an ideal made up of blended chivalric and classical accomplishments and virtues, — a pattern which, followed, produced the perfect knight-scholar. The book was translated into all the

chief European languages and exerted a vast influence upon life and manners everywhere, and especially in England. It helped to form some of the noblest characters of the Elizabethan age. "There is not the slightest reason for doubting," says Professor Saintsbury, "that Sidney himself had the *Courtier* and its ideal constantly before him."

Secondary or Modern Works. — The literature on the Renaissance is very extensive; we shall suggest only a few titles. SYMONDS (J. A.), ***The Renaissance in Italy*, 7 vols. (new ed., 1897–1898). This is the best extended history in English of the Italian Renaissance. There is a serviceable single-volume abridgment of the work by Alfred Pearson. BURCKHARDT (J.), **The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (trans. from the German). Perhaps the most suggestive work on the subject. VILLARI (P.), **Life and Times of Niccolò Machiavelli* (trans. by Linda Villari), vol. i. MRS. OLIPHANT, *Makers of Florence* and *Makers of Venice*. FIELD (L. F.), *An Introduction to the Study of the Renaissance*. ADAMS (G. B.), *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. xv, "The Renaissance." LODGE (R.), *The Close of the Middle Ages* (Periods of European History), chap. xxii, "The Renaissance in Italy." PATER (W.), *The Renaissance: Studies in Art and Poetry*. PUTNAM (G. H.), *Books and their Makers during the Middle Ages*, vol. i, pt. ii, "The Earlier Printed Books." SAINTSBURY (G.), *The Earlier Renaissance* (Periods of European Literature), chap. i, "The Harvest-Time of Humanism." VAN DYKE (P.), *The Age of the Renaissance* (Ten Epochs of Church History). Surveys the movements and events of the period of the revival from the viewpoint of the Church historian. GRIMM (H.), *The Life of Michael Angelo*, 2 vols. (trans. from the German). EWART (K. D.), *Cosimo de' Medici* (Foreign Statesmen). ROSCOE (W.), *The Life of Lorenzo de' Medici*. Various editions. ARMSTRONG (E.), *Lorenzo de' Medici and Florence in the Fifteenth Century* (Heroes of the Nations). A work more easily secured than the preceding, and one which will meet the needs of the ordinary student. In the "Foreign Classics for English Readers" series can be found an admirable little volume on Dante by Mrs. Oliphant and another on Petrarch by Reeve. PAGET, VIOLET (Vernon Lee, pseud.), *Euphorion: being Studies of the Antique and the Mediæval in the Renaissance*, 2 vols. A work of real insight. The article by Symonds entitled "Renaissance" in the *Encyc. Brit.* is very compact and suggestive.

CHAPTER XIX

GROWTH OF THE NATIONS: FORMATION OF NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS AND LITERATURES

310. Introductory. — The most important political movement that marked the latter part of the Middle Ages was the fusion, in several of the countries of Europe, of the petty feudal principalities and half-independent cities and communes into great nations with strong centralized governments. This movement was accompanied by, or rather consisted in, the decline of feudalism as a governmental system, the loss by the cities of their freedom, and the growth of the power of the kings. It was the counterpart of that decay which we have noticed of the papacy and the empire as real forces in European affairs, and as ideals. The attempt to organize Christendom as a single great society headed by pope and emperor having failed, Europe is now reconstructed in accordance with a new ideal, — that of absolutely independent states, or nations.

Many things contributed to this consolidation of peoples and governments, different circumstances favoring the movement in the different countries. In some countries, however, conditions were opposed to the centralizing tendency, and in these the Modern Age was reached without nationality having been found. But in England, in France, and in Spain circumstances all seemed to tend towards unity, and by the close of the fifteenth century there were established in these countries strong despotic monarchies. Yet even among those peoples where national governments did not appear, some progress was made towards unity through the formation of national

languages and literatures, and the development of common feelings and aspirations, so that these races or peoples were manifestly only awaiting the opportunities of a happier period for the maturing of their national life.

This rise of monarchy and decline of feudalism, this substitution of strong centralized governments in place of the feeble, irregular, and conflicting rule of the feudal nobles or of other local authorities, was a very great gain to the cause of law and good order. It paved the way for modern progress and civilization.

In these changes the political liberties of all classes, of the cities as well as of the nobility, were, it is true, subverted. But though Liberty was lost, Nationality was found. And the people may be trusted to win back freedom, as we shall see. Those sturdy burghers — the merchants, artisans, lawyers of the cities — who, in the eleventh century, showed themselves stronger than *lords*, will in time, with the help of the yeomanry, prove themselves stronger than *kings*. Europe shall be not only orderly, but free. Out of despotic monarchy will rise constitutional, representative government.

I. England.

311. General Statement. — In earlier chapters we told of the origin of the English people, and traced their growth under Saxon, Danish, and Norman rulers. In the present section we shall tell very briefly the story of their fortunes under the Plantagenet house and its branches, thus carrying on our narrative to the accession of the Tudors in 1485, from which event dates the beginning of the modern history of England.

The line of Plantagenet kings began in 1154 with Henry II, son of Queen Matilda and Geoffrey Plantagenet of Anjou, and ended with Richard III in 1485. The dynasty, in its direct line and in its branches (Lancaster and York), thus

ted three hundred and thirty-one years, and embraced ourteen sovereigns.[1]

The era of the Plantagenets was a most eventful one in English history. It was under these kings that the English constitution took on its present form, and those charters and laws were framed which are rightly esteemed the bulwark of English freedom. Moreover, the wars of the period were, for the most part, attended by far-reaching consequences, and so helped to render the age memorable.

The chief events of the period which we shall notice were the martyrdom of Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, the loss of the English possessions in France, the wresting of *Magna Charta* from King John, the formation of the House of Commons, the conquest of Wales, the wars with Scotland, the Hundred Years' War with France, and the Wars of the Roses.

312. The Martyrdom of Thomas Becket (1172). — The most impressive event in the reign of the first Plantagenet was a tragedy, — the murder of Thomas Becket, the archbishop of Canterbury. This event possesses great historical interest for the reason that it grew out of those contentions between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities which, as we have seen, make up a large part of mediæval history.

The circumstances leading up to the tragedy were these. In the early years of Henry's reign Thomas had been a favorite courtier, and chancellor of the realm. Thinking that he would serve him well as primate, Henry made him

[1] The name Plantagenet came from the peculiar badge, a sprig of broom-plant (*plante de genêt*), adopted by one of the early members of the house. Following is a table of the sovereigns of the family:

Henry II	1154–1189	HOUSE OF LANCASTER.	
Richard I	1189–1199	Henry IV	1399–1413
John	1199–1216	Henry V	1413–1422
Henry III	1216–1272	Henry VI	1422–1461
Edward I	1272–1307	HOUSE OF YORK.	
Edward II	1307–1327	Edward IV	1461–1483
Edward III	1327–1377	Edward V	1483
Richard II	1377–1399	Richard III	1483–1485

archbishop of Canterbury. Thomas, whose life at court had given Henry a wrong impression of his genuine character, had advised his master against doing this: "I warn you," he said, "that if such a thing should be, our friendship would soon turn to bitter hate."

The prophecy soon fulfilled itself. As archbishop, Thomas came into conflict with the king on several matters involving the relations of the clergy to the civil power, the most important of which was a question regarding the trial of clerks by the secular courts.

We have already spoken of the extended jurisdiction of the courts of the Church in the different countries of Europe (par. 140). At this time in England the power and privileges of the ecclesiastical tribunals had become so extensive, through grants from William the Conqueror and through usurpation, that the royal authority was unduly restricted. The entire order of the clergy was exempt from the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts of justice. Since the Church courts could inflict no severer penalty than imprisonment, it often happened that clerks guilty of the most heinous crimes, even of murder, were punished inadequately, or even not at all. Moreover, the judges of these courts were said to be over-lenient in dealing with accused members of their own order.

Henry resolved that the clergy, like laymen, should be subject to the civil courts. To this end he caused to be drawn up the so-called Constitutions of Clarendon (1164), a collection of "a certain part of the customs, liberties, and dignities of his ancestors," which among other things provided that persons in orders accused of crime should be tried by the king's judges, if these judges deemed the cases to be such as should come before them, and that no case should be appealed from the courts of the archbishops to the pope, without the king's consent.

Thomas, after some hesitation, swore to observe the Constitutions, but almost immediately he repented having done so, and sought and obtained from the pope release from his oath.

He maintained that the ordinances took away from the Church necessary and undoubted rights and privileges.

His course led to a long and violent quarrel with the king. Finally Henry dropped an impatient expression which four of his courtier knights interpreted as a wish that Thomas should be put out of the way. These men sought out the archbishop in the cathedral at Canterbury, and murdered him on the steps of the altar there.

The people ever regarded Thomas as a martyr, who had died to maintain the just privileges of the Church, and his tomb in the cathedral became a place of pilgrimage. Three hundred years later the poet Chaucer made the journey thither of a goodly company of pilgrims the groundwork of his celebrated *Canterbury Tales* (par. 334).

The attitude of the people after the murder of Thomas compelled Henry to give up the idea of enforcing the provisions of the Constitutions of Clarendon. Moreover, he was constrained to do penance for his participation in the crime by submitting to a flogging by the monks of Canterbury at the martyr's tomb. His humiliation recalls the humiliation of Henry IV of Germany almost exactly a hundred years before. It was the English Canossa.

313. **Loss of the English Possessions in France** (1202–1204). — The issue of the battle of Hastings, in 1066, made William of Normandy king of England. But we must bear in mind that he still held his possessions in France as a fief from the French king, whose vassal he was. These continental lands, save for some short intervals, remained under the rule of William's Norman successors in England. Then, when Henry, count of Anjou, came to the English throne as the first of the Plantagenets, these territories were greatly increased by the French possessions of that prince. The larger part of Henry's dominions, indeed, was in France, the whole of the western half of the country being in his hands; but for all of this he *of course* paid homage to the French king.

THE DOMINIONS OF
THE
ANGEVINS
OR
PLANTAGENETS
SCALE OF MILES
0 50 100 150
NORTH SEA
English Channel
Irish Channel
BAY OF BISCAY
ENGLAND
WALES
SCOTLAND
IRELAND
FRANCE
THE EMPIRE
ULSTER
CONNAUGHT
LEINSTER
MUNSTER
ANGLESEY
NORMANDY
BRITTANY
MAINE
ANJOU
POITOU
AQUITAINE
GASCONY
LANGUEDOC
BURGUNDY
CHAMPAGNE
FLANDERS
Perth
Stirling
Edinburgh
Alnwyck
Newcastle
Durham
Carlisle
Solway Firth
Armagh
Dundalk
Drogheda
Dublin
Limerick
Cashel
Waterford
Wexford
Chester
York
Leicester
Gloucester
Bristol
Milford
Salisbury
Exeter
Winchester
Southampton
Windsor
Clarendon
Canterbury
Dover
Calais
Boulogne
Cherbourg
Havre
Caen
Rouen
Andelys
Arundel
Verdun
Paris
Troyes
Orleans
Blois
Tours
Le Mans
Angers
Chinon
Loudun
Mirebeau
Brest
Quimper
Rennes
Dol
Avranches
Pinchebrai
Lusignan
Thouars
Montreuil
Limoges
Bordeaux
Toulouse
Avignon
Arles
Lyons
Auvergne
Marche
R. Thames
R. Severn
R. Humber
R. Trent
R. Ouse
R. Tweed
R. Tees
R. Forth
R. Tay
R. Esk
R. Dee
R. Clyde
R. Nith
R. Liffey
R. Shannon
R. Boyne
R. Barrow
R. Suir
R. Nore
R. Slaney
R. Mersey
R. Dee
R. Wye
R. Usk
R. Avon
R. Exe
R. Tamar
R. Stour
R. Rhine
R. Marne
R. Seine
R. Loire
R. Garonne
R. Adour
R. Rhone
R. Saone
R. Meuse
The Wash
Newark
Oxford
Milford
Portsmouth
Plymouth
Barnstaple
Bridgewater
Chichester
Dover
Ypres
Ghent
Bruges
Antwerp
Brussels
Liege
Metz
Strasbourg
Basle
Geneva
Mont Cenis
Mont Blanc
Maurienne
Piedmont
Provence
Languedoc
Gascony
Aquitaine
Poitou
Normandy
Brittany
Anjou
Maine
Burgundy
Champagne
Flanders
Auvergne
Berry
Touraine
Orleans
Paris
London
Ireland
Scotland
Wales
England
France
Empire

As was inevitable, a feeling of intense jealousy sprang up between the two sovereigns. The French king was ever watching for some pretext upon which he might deprive his rival of his possessions in France. The opportunity came when John, in 1199, succeeded Richard the Lion-hearted as king of England. That odious tyrant had not been long seated upon the throne before his vassals of Poitou carried complaints of his misconduct to Philip Augustus, then king of France. Philip summoned John to appear and clear himself of the charge before his French peers. John refusing to do so, all the lands he held as fiefs of the French crown were declared forfeited (1202). Philip straightway invaded Normandy. In the fighting which followed John got possession of the person of his nephew Arthur, who had laid claim to the English crown. The boy soon disappeared, and John was accused, and doubtless justly, of having murdered him. Philip now ordered John to appear and clear himself of this new charge. John as before refused to obey the summons. Philip was now able, so strong was the feeling against John, to dispossess him of all his lands in France, save a part of Aquitaine in the south.

The loss of these lands was a great gain to England. The Angevin kings had been pursuing a policy which, had it been successful, would have made England a subordinate part of a great continental state. That danger was now averted. In the words of Freeman, "England had been a dependency of Anjou; Aquitaine was now a dependency of England."

314. Magna Charta (1215).—*Magna Charta*, the "Great Charter," held sacred as the safeguard of English liberties, was an instrument which the English barons and clergy wrested from King John, and in which the ancient rights and privileges of the people were clearly defined and guaranteed.

The circumstances which led up to this memorable transaction, narrated in the briefest way possible, were as follows: Among the kings of foreign race whom the Norman Conquest



chief European languages and exerted a vast influence upon life and manners everywhere, and especially in England. It helped to form some of the noblest characters of the Elizabethan age. "There is no the slightest reason for doubting," says Professor Saintsbury, "that Sidney himself had the *Courtier* and its ideal constantly before him."

Secondary or Modern Works. — The literature on the Renaissance is very extensive; we shall suggest only a few titles. SYMONDS (J. A.), ***The Renaissance in Italy*, 7 vols. (new ed., 1897–1898). This is the best extended history in English of the Italian Renaissance. There is a serviceable single-volume abridgment of the work by Alfred Pearson. BURCKHARDT (J.), **The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (trans. from the German). Perhaps the most suggestive work on the subject. VILLARI (P.), **Life and Times of Niccolò Machiavelli* (trans. by Linda Villari), vol. i. MRS. OLIPHANT, *Makers of Florence* and *Makers of Venice*. FIELD (L. F.), *An Introduction to the Study of the Renaissance*. ADAMS (G. B.), *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. xv, "The Renaissance." LODGE (R.), *The Close of the Middle Ages* (Periods of European History), chap. xxii, "The Renaissance in Italy." PATER (W.), *The Renaissance: Studies in Art and Poetry*. PUTNAM (G. H.), *Books and their Makers during the Middle Ages*, vol. i, pt. ii, "The Earlier Printed Books." SAINTSBURY (G.), *The Earlier Renaissance* (Periods of European Literature), chap. i, "The Harvest-Time of Humanism." VAN DYKE (P.), *The Age of the Renaissance* (Ten Epochs of Church History). Surveys the movements and events of the period of the revival from the viewpoint of the Church historian. GRIMM (H.), *The Life of Michael Angelo*, 2 vols. (trans. from the German). EWART (K. D.), *Cosimo de' Medici* (Foreign Statesmen). ROSCOE (W.), *The Life of Lorenzo de' Medici*. Various editions. ARMSTRONG (E.), *Lorenzo de' Medici and Florence in the Fifteenth Century* (Heroes of the Nations). A work more easily secured than the preceding, and one which will meet the needs of the ordinary student. In the "Foreign Classics for English Readers" series can be found an admirable little volume on Dante by Mrs. Oliphant and another on Petrarch by Reeve. PAGET, VIOLET (Vernon Lee, pseud.), *Euphorion: being Studies of the Antique and the Mediæval in the Renaissance*, 2 vols. A work of real insight. The article by Symonds entitled "Renaissance" in the *Encyc. Brit.* is very compact and suggestive.

brought into England there were those who disregarded the customs and institutions of the realm and ruled in a very arbitrary and despotic manner. King John, as will easily be believed from the revelation of his character already made, surpassed the worst of his predecessors in tyranny and wickedness.

In another place we have told how John, having quarreled with the pope respecting the filling of vacant offices in the English churches, was excommunicated and his kingdom placed under an interdict, and how he finally made his peace with the Church by doing homage to the pope and making England a fief tributary to the papal see (par. 232).

As the pope's vassal John conducted himself more insolently than before. The barons of the realm, who were burning with resentment towards him because of the many insults and outrages which he had heaped upon them, now rose in open revolt, being counseled and encouraged to this action by the patriot archbishop of Canterbury, Stephen Langton. Indeed, the king was supported by no class. The movement was an uprising of the nation, determined upon the recovery of its time-honored liberties. The tyrant was forced to bow to the storm. He met his barons at Runnymede, a flat meadow on the Thames a little way from Windsor, and there affixed his seal to the instrument that had been prepared to receive it.

Among the important articles of the Great Charter, which was based on an earlier charter granted by Henry I, were the following, which we give as showing at once the nature of the venerable document, and the kind of grievances of which the people had occasion to complain:

ART. 12. "No scutage[2] or aid shall be imposed in our kingdom except by the common council of our kingdom, except for the ransoming of our body, for the making of our oldest son a knight,

[2] Scutage was a money payment made in commutation of personal military service.

and for once marrying our oldest daughter, and for these purposes it shall be only a reasonable aid ;[3] . . .

ART. 39. "No free man shall be taken or imprisoned or dispossessed, or outlawed, or banished, or in any way destroyed, nor will we go upon him, nor send upon him, except by the legal judgment of his peers or by the law of the land.

ART. 40. "To no one will we sell, to no one will we deny, or delay right or justice."[4]

Besides these articles, which embody most important principles of the English constitution, there were others abolishing numerous abuses and confirming various time-honored rights and privileges of the towns and of different classes of freemen.

To secure the observance of the Charter on the part of the king, in whose sincerity the barons had no confidence, John was forced to put the tower and city of London in the hands of the nobles as a pledge, and also to allow a body consisting of twenty-four barons and the mayor of London to be appointed as "guardians of the liberties of the realm," with the right and power of declaring war against the king, should he violate the oath he had sworn. Thus carefully was guarded the Great Charter, the palladium of English liberties.

The Great Charter did not create new rights and privileges, but in its main points simply re-asserted and confirmed old usages and laws. It was immediately violated by John, and afterwards was disregarded by many of his successors; but the people always clung to it as the warrant and safeguard of their liberties, and again and again forced tyrannical kings to renew and confirm its provisions, and swear solemnly to observe all its articles.

[3] This article respecting taxation was suffered to fall into abeyance in the reign of John's successor, Henry III, and it was not until about one hundred years after the granting of *Magna Charta* that the great principle that the people should be taxed only through their representatives in Parliament became fully established.

[4] Adams and Stephens, *Select Documents of English Constitutional History*.

Considering the far-reaching consequences that resulted from the granting of *Magna Charta*, — the securing of constitutional liberty as an inheritance for the English-speaking race in all parts of the world, — it must always be considered the most important concession that a freedom-loving people ever wrung from a tyrannical sovereign.

315. Beginnings of the House of Commons (1265). — The reign of Henry III (1216-1272), John's son and successor, witnessed the second important step taken in English constitutional freedom. This was the formation of the House of Commons, the Great Council having up to this time been made up of nobles and bishops. It was again the royal misbehavior — so frequently is it, as Lieber says, that Liberty is indebted to bad kings, though to them she owes no thanks — that led to this great change in the form of the English national assembly.

Henry had become even more tyrannical than his father. He had violated his oath to observe the provisions of the Great Charter, had filled the offices of the kingdom with foreign favorites, and had ruled so arbitrarily as to stir the anger of all classes. In the words of a contemporary, the English were oppressed "like as the people of Israel under Pharaoh." The final outcome was an uprising of the barons and the people similar to that in the reign of King John.

The leader of the revolt was Earl Simon, a son of the Simon de Montfort who led the first crusade against the Albigenses. Although a foreigner, Earl Simon was very different from the most of those foreigners whom Henry had honored with positions and titles. He was as strenuous in his defense of the ancient laws and customs of the English as were the English themselves. Henry confessed that he feared Earl Simon "more than all the thunder and lightning in the world."

It was soon open war between the king and his people. In a great engagement known as the battle of Lewes (1264), the *royal forces* were defeated, and Henry was taken prisoner.

Earl Simon now did that which entitles him to the lasting gratitude of the English people. In order to rally all classes to the support of the cause he represented, he issued, in the king's name, writs of summons to the barons (save the king's adherents), the bishops, and the abbots to meet in Parliament; and at the same time sent similar writs to the sheriffs of the different shires, directing them "to return two knights for the body of their county, with two citizens or burghers for every city and borough contained in it." [5]

Although the knights of the different shires, who found attendance at the meetings of the national assembly very burdensome, had in several instances before this been represented by delegates,[6] so that the principle of representation was not now for the first time introduced into the English constitution, still this was the first time when plain untitled citizens, or burghers, had been called to take their place with the barons, bishops, and knights, in the great council of the nation, to join in deliberations on the affairs of the realm.[7]

From this gathering, then, may be dated the birth of the House of Commons (1265). Formed as it was of knights and burghers, representatives of the common people, it was at first a weak and timorous body, quite overawed by the great lords, but was destined finally to grow into the controlling branch of the British Parliament.

Just thirty years later (in 1295), in the reign of Edward I, there was gathered through regular constitutional summons what came to be called the Model Parliament, since in its composition it served as a pattern for later Parliaments.

[5] Compare par. 264.

[6] In 1254 four representative knights from each shire had been summoned to the Great Council, and again in 1261 three knights from each county.

[7] At first the burghers could take part only in questions relating to taxation, but gradually they acquired the right to share in all matters that might come before Parliament. It is probable that the Commons at first met in Westminster Hall with the Lords, though their votes were kept distinct. But very soon we find them gathered in a separate chamber.

316. Conquest of Wales (1272-1282). — For more than seven hundred years after the withdrawal of the Romans from Britain, the Celtic tribes of Wales maintained among their mountain fastnesses an ever-renewed struggle with the successive invaders of the island — with Saxon, Dane, and Norman. They were forced to acknowledge the overlordship of some of the Saxon and Norman kings. But they were restless vassals, and were constantly withholding tribute and refusing homage.

Upon the accession of the Plantagenets the old struggle was renewed with greater fierceness than ever. It was the Welsh bards who, at this time, by their fiery, patriotic anthems, did much to inspire the people to a last determined and gallant effort to rid their entire land forever of the invaders, and regain their lost liberties. As an illustration of the power of song, it is the story of the martial poet Tyrtæus and the Spartan warriors repeated. Everywhere the slumbering embers of Celtic patriotism were fanned into an uncontrollable flame. Under the lead of a line of brave chieftains known as the Lords of Snowdon, the Welsh all but shook off the hated yoke of the English kings.

When Edward I (1272–1307) came to the English throne, Llewellyn III, who held the overlordship of the Welsh chiefs, refused to render homage to the new king. Edward led a strong army into the fastnesses of the country, and quickly reduced his rebel vassal to submission. A few years later, and the Welsh patriots were again in arms; but the uprising was soon crushed, and Llewellyn was slain (1282). His head, after the barbarous manner of the times, was exposed over the gateway of the Tower of London. The last remnant of Welsh independence was now extinguished.[8]

The strong-walled and picturesque castle-fortresses — those at Conway and Carnarvon are particularly celebrated — which

[8] *A little more than a century later* (1400) there was another revolt under the *hero Owen Glendower* (Glyndwr), which was suppressed with great severity.

Edward built or strengthened to guard the conquered land are, like the old watch-towers of the Norman kings in England, historical monuments of the greatest interest to the modern traveler in Wales.

Edward adopted a conciliatory policy in dealing with the conquered people. He seemed to think, however, that a little duplicity might be harmlessly employed; for tradition tells how, having promised to give them a native-born prince who could not speak a word of French or English, he presented to them his own infant son Edward, born during the campaign, in the Welsh castle of Carnarvon. Whether the legend be true or not, this same prince, while yet a mere child, was made feudal lord of the Welsh, with the title of Prince of Wales; and from that time the title has usually been borne by the eldest son of the English sovereign.

For two centuries after the death of Llewellyn the Welsh were the unwilling subjects of England. Then occurred a happy circumstance — the accession to the English throne of a prince of Welsh descent; for Henry Tudor, the first of the Tudor dynasty, was the grandson of a Welsh knight, named Owen Tudor. With princes of the ancient British race reigning in London, the Welsh, from sullen subjects, were suddenly transformed into enthusiastic and loyal supporters of the English throne.

317. **Wars with Scotland** (1296–1328). — With the Welsh tribes reduced to submission, Edward turned his attention to the conquest of Scotland; for it was the resolve of this ambitious king, from the very outset of his reign, to extend the authority of the English crown over the whole of the island of Britain.

From the time of King Alfred's son Edward, the kings of England had intermittently laid claim to the suzerainty of the Scottish realm. The Norman and Plantagenet kings down to the time of Edward I were constantly quarreling with the Scots about this matter of English overlordship and Scotch vassalage.

An opportunity now presented itself for Edward to secure full recognition of suzerain rights over Scotland. In 1285 the ancient Celtic line of Scottish chiefs became extinct. A great number of claimants for the vacant throne immediately arose. Chief among these were Robert Bruce and John Balliol, distinguished noblemen of Norman descent, attached to the Scottish court.

Edward was asked to act as arbitrator, and decide to whom the crown should be given. He consented to do so, and met the Scottish lords at Norham; but before taking up the question he demanded that the Scottish nobles should acknowledge him as their feudal suzerain. As Edward had a large army at this moment on the march up through England, the Scotch chiefs could not do otherwise than admit his claims to the suzerainty of their country, and do homage to him as their overlord. Edward's commissioners then decided the question of the succession in favor of Balliol, who now took the crown of Scotland as the fully acknowledged vassal of the English sovereign (1292).

Balliol soon broke the feudal ties which bound him to Edward and sought an alliance with the French king. In the war that followed, the Scots were defeated, and Scotland fell back as a forfeited fief into the hands of Edward (1296). As a sign that the Scottish kingdom had come to an end, Edward carried off to London the royal regalia, and with this a large stone, known as the Stone of Scone, upon which the Scottish kings, from time out of memory, had been accustomed to be crowned. Legend declared that the relic was the very stone which Jacob made his pillow at Bethel. The block was taken to Westminster Abbey, and there put beneath the seat of a stately throne-chair, which to this day is used in the coronation ceremonies of the English sovereigns.[9]

[9] It is said that the stone once bore this legend:

> "Should fate not fail, where'er this stone be found,
> The Scot shall monarch of that realm be crowned";

The two countries were not long united. The Scotch people loved too well their ancient liberties to submit quietly to this extinguishment of their national independence. Under the inspiration and lead of the famous Sir William Wallace, an outlaw knight, all the Lowlands were soon in determined revolt. It was chiefly from the peasantry that the patriot hero drew his followers. Wallace gained some successes,[10] but at length was betrayed into Edward's hands. He was condemned to death as a traitor, and his head, garlanded with a crown of laurel, was fixed on London Bridge (1305). The romantic life of Wallace, his patriotic services, his heroic exploits, and his tragic death, at once lifted him to the place that he has ever since held as the national hero of Scotland.

The struggle in which Wallace had fallen was soon renewed by the almost equally renowned hero Robert Bruce (grandson of the Robert Bruce mentioned on p. 374), who was the representative of the nobles, as Wallace had been of the common people. With Edward II [11] Bruce fought the great battle of Bannockburn, near Stirling. Edward's army, consisting of a large body of horsemen and foot-soldiers, was almost annihilated (1314). It was the most appalling disaster that had befallen the arms of the English people since the memorable defeat of Harold at Hastings.

The independence of Scotland really dates from the great victory of Bannockburn, but the English were too proud to

which prophecy was fulfilled when James VI of Scotland became James I of England. "Whether the prophecy was actually inscribed on the stone may be doubted, though this seems to be implied, and on the lower side is still visible a groove which may have contained it; but the fact that it was circulated and believed as early as the fourteenth century, is certain." — DEAN STANLEY, *Memorials of Westminster Abbey.*

[10] Notably a great victory at what is known as the battle of Stirling (1297).

[11] Edward I died while on a campaign against the Scots (1307). He was one of the ablest and best beloved of English kings. He so improved the laws of the realm, and made such great and beneficent changes in the administration of justice as to earn the title of the "English Justinian."

acknowledge it until after fourteen years more of war. Finally, in the year 1328, the young king Edward III gave up all claim to the Scottish crown, and Scotland, with the hero Bruce as its king, took its place as an independent power among the nations of Europe.

Respecting the results to both the English and the Scotch of the failure of the Edwards to subject Scotland to their rule, the historian Gardiner finely comments as follows: "Morally, both nations were in the end the gainers. The hardihood and self-reliance of the Scottish character is distinctly to be traced to those years of struggle against a powerful neighbor. England, too, was the better for being balked of its prey. No nation can suppress the liberty of another without endangering its own."

The independence gained by the Scotch at Bannockburn was maintained for nearly three centuries, — until 1603, — when the crowns of England and Scotland were peacefully united in the person of James VI of Scotland, who became James I of England, the founder of the Stuart dynasty of English kings. During the greater part of these three hundred years the two countries were very quarrelsome neighbors.

The Hundred Years' War (1338–1453).

318. Causes of the War. — The long and wasteful war between England and France known in history as the Hundred Years' War was a most eventful one, and its effect upon both England and France so important and lasting as to entitle it to a prominent place in the records of the closing events of the Middle Ages. Freeman likens the contest to the Peloponnesian War in ancient Greece; and Hallam says that since the fall of Rome there had been no war among European nations "so memorable as that of Edward III and his successors against France, whether we consider its duration, its objects, or the magnitude and variety of its events."

The war with Scotland was one of the things that led up to this war. All through that struggle, France, as the old and jealous rival of England, was ever giving aid and encouragement to the Scots. Then the English possessions in France, for which the English king owed homage to the French sovereign as overlord, were a source of constant dispute between the two countries. Trade jealousies also contributed to the causes of mutual hostility.

Furthermore, upon the death of Charles IV of France, the last of the direct Capetian line, Edward III laid claim, through his mother, daughter of Philip the Fair, to the French crown. His claims were set aside by the peers of France in favor of Philip of Valois, who mounted the throne as the first of the Valois dynasty; but notwithstanding this decision, shortly after the beginning of the war, Edward assumed the French arms and the title King of France.

319. The Battle of Crécy (1346). — The first great combat of the long war was the famous battle of Crécy. Edward had invaded France with a strong force, made up largely of English bowmen, and had penetrated far into the country, ravaging the land as he went, when he finally halted, and faced the pursuing French army near the village of Crécy, where he inflicted upon it a most terrible defeat. Twelve hundred knights, the flower of French chivalry, and thousands of foot-soldiers lay dead upon the field.

The great battle of Crécy is memorable for several reasons; but chiefly because feudalism and chivalry there received their death-blow. The yeomanry of England there showed themselves superior to the chivalry of France. "The lesson which England had learned at Bannockburn," writes Green, "she taught the world at Crécy. The whole social and political fabric of the Middle Ages rested on a military base, and its base was suddenly withdrawn. The churl had struck down the noble; the bowman proved more than a match, in sheer hard fighting, for the knight. From the day of Crécy, feudalism

tottered slowly but surely to its grave." The battles of the world were thereafter to be fought and won, not by mail-clad knights with battle-ax and lance, but by common foot-soldiers with bow and gun.

320. The Siege and Capture of Calais (1346–1347). — From the field of Crécy Edward led his army to the siege of Calais, an important seaport on the Channel, whence issued many of the pirate ships that had long troubled English commerce. At the end of a year's siege, the city, reduced to the verge of starvation, fell into the hands of the English.

The capture of Calais was a very important event for the English, as it gave them control of the commerce of the Channel, and afforded a convenient landing-place for their expeditions of invasion. The French citizens were driven out of the place, and it was peopled with English immigrants. The port remained in the hands of the English a century and more after the close of the Hundred Years' War — until the reign of Queen Mary.

321. The Black Death (1347–1349). — At just this time there fell upon Europe the awful pestilence known as the Black Death. The plague was introduced into Europe from the East by way of the trade routes of the Mediterranean, and from the southern countries spread in the course of a few years over the entire continent, its virulence without doubt being greatly increased by the unsanitary condition of the crowded towns and the wretched mode of living of the poorer classes.

In many places almost all the people fell victims to the scourge. Of the city of Bristol, in England, a chronicler writes: "Almost the whole strength of the town died." Some villages were left without an inhabitant. Many monasteries were almost emptied. In the Mediterranean and the Baltic ships were seen drifting about without a soul on board. Crops rotted unharvested in the fields; herds and flocks wandered about unattended. It is estimated that from one-third to one-*half of* the population of Europe perished. Hecker, an

historian of the pestilence, estimates the total number of victims at twenty-five millions. It was the most awful calamity that ever befell the human race.[12]

This unexampled thinning of the population of Europe had most important religious, social, and economic results, some of which we shall notice in another connection.[13]

322. The Battle of Poitiers (1356). — The terrible scourge caused the contending nations for a time to forget their quarrel. But no sooner had a purer atmosphere breathed upon the Continent than their minds were again turned to war, and the old struggle was renewed with fresh eagerness.

Edward planned a double invasion of France. He himself led an army through the already wasted provinces of the North, while his eldest son, known from the color of the armor he wore as the Black Prince, ravaged with another the rich and flourishing lands of the South. As the prince's army, numbering about eight thousand men, loaded with booty, was making its way back to the coast, it found its path, near Poitiers, obstructed by a French army of fifty thousand, led by King John, the successor of Philip. A battle ensued which proved for the French a second Crécy. The arrows of the English bowmen drove them in fatal panic from the field, which was strewn with thousands of their dead. King John and his son Philip were taken prisoners, but, much to the credit of their conqueror, were treated like honored guests in the tent of the Black Prince.

323. The Treaty of Bretigny (1360). — John was held prisoner in England for three years, during which time France was distressed by a fresh invasion of the English and by revolts of the peasantry, whom the ravages and burdens of incessant war had driven to desperation. Finally, by the Treaty of

[12] Under the terror and excitement of the dreadful visitation, religious penitents, thinking to turn away the wrath of heaven by unusual penances, went about in procession, lacerating themselves with whips (hence they were called *flagellants*). This religious frenzy had its most remarkable manifestation in Germany.

[13] See par. 324.

Bretigny the French king was set at liberty upon payment of an enormous ransom and the promise that he would cease endeavoring to stir up the Scots against the English. By the same treaty Edward was to keep possession of the duchy of Aquitaine and of some other provinces, not, however, as fiefs from the French king, in which way he had hitherto held his lands in France, but in full sovereignty. In return for John's promise to let the Scots alone, he agreed to cease scheming with the Flemings against France.

324. The Peasants' Revolt (1381). — For a great part of the half century following the Peace of Bretigny the war between the two countries was practically suspended. The most important event in English history during this interval was what is known as the Peasants' Revolt.

One of the grievances of the peasants grew out of their relations to the landlords. Many of the former serfs had commuted into money payments the personal services they owed their lords (par. 149) and had thus got rid of this badge of serfdom. They were now free laborers working for hire. The rise in wages occasioned by the Black Death caused the landlords to regret the bargain they had made with their former serfs, since the commutation money would not now pay for as many days' labor as the serfs were originally bound to render. The landlords endeavored to escape from their bad bargain by means of legislation. They secured the enactment by Parliament of a law known as the Statute of Laborers (1351), which made it a misdemeanor for any unemployed laborer to refuse to work for the wages paid before the plague. Attempts to enforce this statute caused much discontent and trouble.

The hard conditions under which those still held in serfdom led their lives constituted another grievance of a large class. In these words of one of the leaders of the uprising we hear the burden of their complaint: "For what reason do they hold us in bondage? Are we not all descended from the same *parents* Adam and Eve? And what can they show, or what

reasons give, why they should be more the masters than ourselves?"

A third grievance of the peasants, and seemingly the immediate cause of the revolt, was the imposition of a heavy poll tax, which struck the poor as well as the rich, to meet the expenses of the French war.

The storm burst in 1381. The peasants rose in almost every part of England and marched in crowds upon London. Their most noted leaders were Wat Tyler, Jack Straw, and John Ball. The essence of their demands was the abolition of villainage (serfdom) in England.

There was tumult and violence everywhere. Abbeys and manor houses were sacked, and the charters which were the evidence of the peasants' servitude were burned.

The revolt had the usual issue. The bands of insurgents were finally scattered and their leaders were pitilessly put to death.

Yet the insurrection was a success after all. The fear of another uprising and the inefficient character of sullen labor caused the landlords to hasten the process that had long been going on of commuting into money payments the grudgingly rendered personal services of the serfs. At the end of a hundred years after the revolt there were very few serfs to be found in England.

The abolition of serfdom was an important step in the nationalization of the English people. Sweeping away artificial barriers between classes, it hastened the unification of English society and the creation of a true English nation.

325. Battle of Agincourt (1415). — During the reign in England of Henry V, the second sovereign of the house of Lancaster, France was unfortunate in having an insane king, Charles VI; and Henry, taking advantage of the disorder into which the French kingdom naturally fell under these circumstances, invaded the country with a powerful army. After losing a great part of his followers through sickness, Henry

finally, with a force of only about ten thousand men, chiefly archers, met a French feudal army fifty thousand strong on the field of Agincourt. The French suffered a most humiliating defeat, their terrible losses falling, as at Crécy, chiefly upon the knighthood.

Five years later was concluded the Treaty of Troyes, according to the terms of which the French crown, upon the death of Charles, was to go to the English king.

326. Joan of Arc; the Relief of Orleans (1429).—But patriotism was not yet wholly extinct among the French people. There were many who regarded the concessions of the Treaty of Troyes as not only weak and shameful, but as unjust to the Dauphin[14] Charles, who was thereby disinherited, and they accordingly refused to be bound by its provisions. Consequently, when the poor insane king died, the terms of the treaty could not be carried out in full, and the war dragged on. The party that stood by their native prince, afterwards crowned as Charles VII, were at last reduced to most desperate straits. The greater part of the country was in the hands of the English, who were holding in close siege the important city of Orleans (1428).

But the darkness was the deep gloom that precedes the dawn. A better day was about to rise over the distressed country. A strange deliverer now appears,—the famous Joan of Arc. This young peasant girl, with imagination all aflame from brooding over her country's wrongs and sufferings, seemed to see visions and hear voices which bade her undertake the work of delivering France. She was obedient unto the heavenly voices.

The warm, impulsive French nation, ever quick in responding to appeals to the imagination, was aroused exactly as it was stirred by the voice of the preachers of the Crusades. Religious enthusiasm now accomplished what patriotism alone could not do.

[14] See par. 345, n. 21.

Rejected by some, yet received by most of her countrymen as a messenger from Heaven, the maiden kindled throughout the land a flame of enthusiasm that nothing could resist. Inspiring the dispirited French soldiers with new courage, she forced the English to raise the siege of Orleans (from which exploit she became known as the Maid of Orleans), and speedily brought about the coronation of Prince Charles at Rheims (1429). Shortly afterward she fell into the hands of the English, was tried by ecclesiastical judges for witchcraft and heresy, and was condemned to be burned as a heretic and a witch. Her martyrdom took place at Rouen in the year 1431.

But the spirit of the Maid had already taken possession of the French nation. From this on, the war, though long continued, went steadily against the English. Little by little they were pushed back and off from the soil they had conquered, and driven out of their own Gascon lands of the south as well, until finally they retained no foothold in the land save Calais.

Thus ended, in 1453, the very year which saw Constantinople fall before the Turks, the Hundred Years' War.

327. Effects of the War upon England. — England suffered less from the protracted war than France, because the latter country was made the battlefield of the contending armies; so that while its harvests were being trampled down, and its villages sacked and burned by marauding bands, the fields and towns of England remained secure from these, the worst evils of war.

Nor was it a small advantage to England to have her turbulent nobles out of the country. The employment of this restless element beyond the limits of the island gave the land unusual quiet. Yet the years of the war were even for England years of great anxiety, burden, and suffering.

But the lasting and important effects of the war were the enhancement of the power of the Lower House of Parliament, and the awakening of a national spirit. The maintaining of the

long and costly quarrel called for such heavy expenditures of men and money that the English kings were made more dependent than hitherto upon the representatives of the people, who were careful to make their grants of supplies conditional upon the correction of abuses or the confirming of their privileges. Thus the war served to make the Commons a power in the English government.

Again, as the war was participated in by all classes alike, so that the commons as well as the nobility were stirred by its movements and interested in its issues, the great victories of Crécy, Poitiers, and Agincourt aroused a national pride, which led to a closer union between the different elements of society. Normans and English, enlisted in a common enterprise, thrilled by similar sentiments and sympathies, were fused by the ardor of a common patriotic enthusiasm into a single people. The real national life of England dates from this time.

The Wars of the Roses (1455–1485).

328. Introductory. — The Wars of the Roses is the name given to a long, shameful, and selfish contest between the adherents of the houses of York and Lancaster, rival branches of the royal family of England. The strife was so named because the Yorkists adopted as their badge a white rose and the Lancastrians a red one.

329. The Earl of Warwick, the King-Maker. — The most prominent figure of this turbulent period, which covers about one generation, is that of the great Earl of Warwick, whose commanding influence — at first he rendered eminent service to the house of York but later cast his influence upon the side of the Lancastrians — earned for him the title of "King-maker." Since the time of Earl Godwin there had perhaps no one arisen among the baronage who was so admired and beloved by the people as he. Thirty thousand persons, it is said, lived upon his different estates. When he journeyed about the

country he was attended by hundreds of retainers, all wearing his livery and badge.

The Earl of Warwick is often spoken of as the "Last of the Barons." We may, perhaps, rightly regard him as the last prominent representative of the feudal aristocracy of England, for the unhappy strife in which he fell — he was killed in an encounter known as the battle of Barnet — accomplished, as we shall notice in a moment, the almost utter ruin of the proud baronage to which he belonged.

330. Chief Battles of the War. — The three battles which may be made to serve as landmarks of the struggle were the first battle of St. Albans (1455), the battle of Towton Field (1461), and the battle of Bosworth Field (1485). The first marks the commencement of the struggle. The second was the most terrible battle fought in England after that of Hastings. The third battle marks the close of the war. In this fight King Richard III,[15] the last of the house of York, was overthrown and slain by Henry Tudor, earl of Richmond, who was crowned on the field with the diadem which had fallen from the head of Richard, and saluted as King Henry VII. With him began the dynasty of the Tudors.

331. The Effects of the Wars. — The first important result of the Wars of the Roses was the ruin of the baronage of England. One half of the nobility were slain. Those that survived were ruined, their estates having been wasted or confiscated during the progress of the struggle. Not a single great house retained its old-time wealth and influence. The war marks the final downfall of feudalism in England.

The second result of the struggle sprang from the first. This was the great peril into which English liberty was cast by the ruin of the nobility. It was primarily the barons who had forced the Great Charter from King John, and who had kept

[15] This is the Richard who, in order to make secure his title to the crown, is believed to have caused the murder of the two little princes, his nephews, in the Tower of London (1483).

him and his successors from reigning like absolute monarchs. Now the once proud and powerful barons were ruined, and their confiscated estates had gone to increase the influence and patronage of the king, who, no longer in wholesome fear of Parliament, for the Commons were as yet weak and timid, did pretty much as he pleased, and became insufferably oppressive and tyrannical, — raising taxes, for instance, without the consent of Parliament, and imprisoning and executing persons without due process of law. For the hundred years following the Wars of the Roses the government of England was rather an absolute than a limited monarchy. In a word, upon the ruins of the baronage was erected a royal despotism. Not until the revolution of the seventeenth century did the people, by overturning the throne of the Stuarts, recover their lost liberties.

Growth of the English Language and Literature.

332. The Language. — From the Norman Conquest to the middle of the fourteenth century there were in use in England three languages: Norman French — a dialect quite different from the pure Parisian French — was the speech of the conquerors and the medium of polite literature; Saxon, or Old English, was the tongue of the conquered people; while Latin was the language of the laws and records, of the church services, and of the works of the learned.

Modern English is the old Saxon tongue worn and improved by use, and enriched by a large infusion of Norman-French words, with less important additions from the Latin and other languages. It took the place of the Norman-French in the courts of law about the middle of the fourteenth century.[16] At this time the language was broken up into many dialects, and the expression "King's English" is supposed to have referred to the standard form employed in state documents and in use at court.

[16] In 1362. See Adams and Stephens, Select *Documents*, p. 128.

333. Effect of the Norman Conquest on English Literature. — The blow that struck down King Harold and his brave thanes on the field of Hastings silenced for the space of above a century the voice of English literature. The tongue of the conquerors became the speech of the court, the nobility, and the clergy; while the language of the despised English was, like themselves, crowded out of every place of honor. But when, after a few generations, the down-trodden race began to re-assert itself, English literature emerged from its obscurity, and, with an utterance somewhat changed, — yet unmistakably it is the same voice, — resumed its interrupted lesson and its broken song.

334. Chaucer (1340?–1400). — Holding a position high above all other writers of early English is Geoffrey Chaucer. He is the first in time, and, after Shakespeare, perhaps the first in genius, among the great poets of the English-speaking race. He is reverently called the "father of English poetry."

Chaucer stands between two ages, the mediæval and the modern. He felt not only the influences of the age of feudalism which was passing away, but also those of the new age of learning and freedom which was dawning. It is because he was so sensitive to these various influences, and reflects his surroundings so faithfully in his writings, that these are so valuable as interpreters of the period in which he lived.

Chaucer's greatest and most important work is his *Canterbury Tales*. The poet represents himself as one of a company of pilgrims who have set out on a journey to the tomb of Thomas Becket at Canterbury (par. 312). The persons, thirty-two in number, making up the party, represent almost every calling and position in the middle class of English society. Thus there is a knight, a nun, a monk, a merchant, a parson, a vender of indulgences, a cook, a ploughman, a country gentleman, several wealthy tradesmen, and various other persons.

To relieve the tedium of the journey, for our pilgrims think that "mirth is none to ride by the way dumb as a stone," it is arranged that each person shall in turn entertain the company with stories, two on the way out and two on the return. It is these tales, — only about twenty of which were finished, — together with a prologue containing characterizations of the different members of the company, that make up the work. The prologue is the most valuable part of the production. Here as in a gallery we have shown to us faithful portraits of our ancestors of the fourteenth century.

Often a single line, illumined by the poet's genial humor, makes a surprising revelation of the manners, ideas, or practices of the times. Thus Chaucer shows us the mail-clad "gentil knight," "lately come from his *viage* [adventure]," and we learn that chivalry has not yet expired. He tells us of the prioress, "simple and coy," who speaks French of the "scole of Stratford atte Bowe, for Frensch of Parys was to hire unknown," and we get a hint of the difference between the French (Norman) spoken in the island of Britain and that at the French capital; and when he further assures us that she "ne wette hire fyngres in hire sauce deepe," and "hire overlippe wypede sche so clene that in hire cuppe was no firthing sene of greece, whan she dronken hadde hire draughte," we infer that knives and forks are not yet in use at table, and that a single cup is made to serve an entire company by being passed from lip to lip. Again, when the poet says of the monk, "Ful many a deynte hors hadde he in stable" and "Greyhoundes he hadde swifte as fowel in flight," we find out something of the habits of the hunting ecclesiastics of Chaucer's time; when he introduces to us the "doctour of phisik" as a person "grounded in astronomye," we learn that astrology yet rules the science of medicine; and when he describes the pardoner as having his wallet "bret-ful of pardouns come from Rome al hoot," we can guess how the age is beginning to think about indulgences.

335. William Langland. — The genial Chaucer shows us the pleasant, attractive side of English society and life; *William* Langland, another writer of the same period, in a poem designated as the *Vision of Piers the Plowman* (1362), lights up for us the world of the poor and the oppressed.

This poem quivers with sympathy for the hungry, labor-worn peasant, doomed to a life of weary routine and hopelessness, despised by haughty lords and robbed by shameless ecclesiastics. The long wars with France had demoralized the nation; the Black Death had just reaped its awful harvest among the ill-clad, ill-fed, and ill-housed poor. Occasional outbursts of wrath against the favored classes are the mutterings of the storm soon to burst upon the social world in the fury of the Peasants' Revolt, and later upon the religious world in the upheavals of the Reformation.

336. John Wycliffe (1324–1384) **and the Lollards.** — Foremost among the reformers and religious writers of the period under review was John Wycliffe, called "the Morning Star of the Reformation." This bold reformer attacked first many of the practices and then certain of the doctrines of the Church. He gave the English people the first translation of the entire Bible in the English language.[17] There was no press at this time to multiply editions of the book, but by means of manuscript copies it was widely circulated and read. Its influence was very great, and from its appearance may be dated the beginnings of the Reformation in England.

Wycliffe did not wholly escape persecution in life, and his bones were not permitted to rest in peace. His enemies attributed to his teachings the unrest and the revolt of the peasants, and this caused him to be looked upon by many as a dangerous agitator. In 1415 the Council of Constance, — the assembly that condemned to the stake Huss and Jerome (par. 371), — having pronounced his doctrines heretical,

[17] For a word respecting the Anglo-Saxon and the pre-Wycliffite English translations of parts of the Scriptures, see p. 435.

ordered that his body be taken from its tomb and burned. This was done, and the ashes were thrown into a neighboring stream called the Swift. "This brook," in the words of the old ecclesiastical writer, Thomas Fuller, "hath conveyed his ashes into Avon, Avon into Severn, Severn into the Narrow Seas, they into the ocean; and thus the ashes of Wycliffe are the emblem of his doctrine, which now is dispersed all the world over."

The followers of Wycliffe became known as "Lollards" (babblers), a term applied to them in derision. Their religious opinions were regarded as erroneous or as heretical; and heresy at that time was hated and feared, at least by those in authority. Parliament passed a law (1401) known as the Statute for the Burning of Heretics (*De haeretico comburendo*), which made it the duty of the proper civil officers, in cases of persons convicted of heresy by the ecclesiastical courts, to receive the same and "before the people, in a high place, cause them to be burnt, that such punishment may strike fear to the hearts of others."

Heretics had been burned in England before the passage of this law, but now for the first time does Parliament by special enactment make this form of punishment the penalty for religious dissent. It was the opening of a sad chapter in English history. Under the statute many persons whose only fault was the teaching or the holding of religious opinions different from those of the Church perished at the stake.

337. Caxton (1412–1491) and the Printing Press. — The great religious movement referred to in the preceding paragraph, which during the sixteenth century transformed the face of England, was hastened by the introduction of printing into the island by William Caxton towards the close of the fifteenth century. The first work which appeared from his press was entitled the *Game of Chess* (1474). He also printed Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, and almost everything else worth reproducing that then existed in the English language, besides various works from the Latin and the French.

The eagerness with which the books which fell from Caxton's press were seized and read by all classes indicates the increasing activity and thoughtfulness of the public mind. Manifestly a new day — one to be filled with intellectual and moral revolutions — was breaking over the land of Alfred and of Wycliffe.

II. France.

338. Beginnings of the French Kingdom. — The separate history of France may be regarded as beginning with the partition of Verdun in 843. At that time Carolingians, of whom we have already learned (chap. vii), exercised the royal power.

Just at the close of the tenth century, in 987, the Capetian dynasty acceded to the throne. The direct Capetian line ruled until 1328, when the Valois branch of the house came into power and ruled until the accession, in 1589, of Henry IV, the first of the Bourbons.

We shall now direct attention to the most noted of the mediæval Capetian kings and narrate very briefly the most important transactions of the period covered by their several reigns. Our special aim will be to give prominence to those matters which concern the gradual consolidation of the French monarchy and the development among the French people of the sentiment of nationality.

France under the Direct Line of the Capetians (987–1328).

339. General Statement. — The Capetian dynasty takes its name from Hugh Capet, duke of Francia, the first of the house. The direct line embraced fourteen kings, whose united reigns spanned a space of three hundred and forty-one years.[18]

[18] Table of the Capetian kings (direct line):

Hugh Capet	987–996	Louis VIII (the Lion)	1223–1226
Robert II (the Pious)	996–1031	Louis IX (the Saint)	1226–1270
Henry I	1031–1060	Philip III (the Bold)	1270–1285
Philip I	1060–1108	Philip IV (the Fair)	1285–1314
Louis VI (the Fat)	1108–1137	Louis X (*le Hutin*)	1314–1316
Louis VII (the Young)	1137–1180	Philip V (the Tall)	1316–1322
Philip II (Augustus)	1180–1223	Charles IV (the Fair)	1322–1328

The first Capetian king differed from his vassal counts and dukes simply in having a more dignified title; his power was scarcely greater than that of many of the lords who paid him homage as their suzerain.

But through forfeiture, conquest, and marriage alliances, one after another of the feudal fiefs was added to the royal domains, until finally the greater part of the kingdom was ruled directly by the crown. Before the close of the Middle Ages France had come to be one of the most compact and powerful kingdoms in Europe. How various events and circumstances conspired to build up the power of the kings at the expense of that of the great feudal lords and of the Church will appear as we go on.

In this place, however, it should be noted that nothing contributed more to the strength and influence of the monarchy during the period of which we are speaking than the fortunate circumstance that for eleven generations, from the accession of Hugh Capet, in 987, to the death of Philip the Fair, in 1314, no French king lacked a son to whom to transmit his authority. For three centuries and a quarter the title was transmitted directly from father to son. With no disputed successions the monarchy grew steadily in power and prestige.

The most noteworthy events of the earlier Capetian period, regarded from the point of view of the growth of the French kingdom, were the acquisition by the French crown of the greater part of the English possessions in France, the Crusades, the admission of the Third Estate to the National Assembly, and the abolition of the order of the Templars.

Of these several matters we will now speak in order.

340. The Acquisition of the English Possessions in France.— In our sketch of the growth of England we spoke of the extensive possessions of the first Angevin kings in France, and told how the larger part of these feudal lands were lost through King John's misconduct and resumed as forfeited fiefs by his

suzerain Philip Augustus, king of France (par. 313). The annexation of these large and flourishing provinces to the crown of France brought a vast accession of power and patronage to the king, who was now easily the superior of any of his great vassals.

341. The French and the Crusades. — The age of the Capetians was the age of the Crusades. These romantic expeditions, while stirring all Christendom, appealed especially to the ardent, imaginative genius of the Gallic race. Three Capetian kings, Louis VII, Philip Augustus, and Louis IX, were themselves leaders of crusades. It was the great predominance of French-speaking persons among the first crusaders which led the Eastern peoples to call them all Franks, the term still used throughout the East to designate Europeans, irrespective of their nationality.

But it is the influence of the Crusades on the French monarchy that we alone need to notice in this place. They tended very materially to weaken the power and influence of the feudal nobility, and in a corresponding degree to strengthen the authority of the crown and add to its dignity. The way in which they brought about this transfer of power from the aristocracy to the king has been already explained in the chapter on the Crusades (par. 227).

In that same chapter we also saw how the crusade against the Albigenses resulted in the almost total extirpation of that heretical sect and in the final acquisition by the French crown of large and rich territories formerly held by the counts of Toulouse, the patrons of the heretics.

342. Admission of the Third Estate to the National Assembly (1302). — The event of the greatest political significance in the Capetian age was the admission, in the reign of Philip the Fair, of the representatives of the towns to the National Assembly.

This transaction is in French history what the creation of the House of Commons is in English history (par. 315). The

popular branches of the two councils were, however, called to take part in the administration of public affairs under very different circumstances. In England it was the nobility that sought the people's aid in their struggle with a despotic king. In France it was the king who summoned the burghers to assist him in his quarrel with the papal see. But the fact that the aid of the commons was courted, whether by nobles or by king, indicates that in both countries the middle class was rising into political importance, and was holding in its hands the balance of power.

The dispute between Philip and the pope to which we have just referred arose, it will be recalled, respecting the control of the offices and revenues of the French Church. In order to rally to his support all classes throughout his kingdom, Philip called a meeting of the National Assembly, to which he invited representatives of the burghers, or inhabitants of the towns (1302).

This council had hitherto been made up of two estates only, — the nobles and the clergy; now is added what comes to be known as the *Tiers État*, or Third Estate, while the assembly henceforth is called the Estates- or States-General. Before the growing power of this Third Estate — a power developed however outside and not within the National Assembly itself — we shall see the Church, the nobility, and the monarchy all go down, just as in England we shall see clergy, nobles, and king yield to the rising power of the English Commons.

But between the two cases we shall observe this difference: in England we shall see the transfer of power effected, for the most part, by gradual and timely reform in institutions and laws; while in France we shall see the same thing, long delayed, finally accomplished amidst scenes of anarchy and terror threatening the destruction of the French nation.

343. **The Abolition of the Order of the Templars (1307).** — The abolition of the order of the Knights of the Temple by *Philip the Fair* affords in some measure a parallel to the

suppression of the English monasteries by Henry VIII in the sixteenth century.

We have already, in connection with the history of the Crusades, learned about the origin of the religious and military order of the Templars (par. 204). In recognition of their services in the holy wars of the Church, they had had bestowed upon them, through the gifts of the pious and the grants of princes, enormous riches and the most unusual privileges. The number of manors and castles that they held in the different countries of Europe, but chiefly in France, is estimated at from nine to ten thousand. But gain in wealth and power had been accompanied apparently by a loss in virtue and piety. At all events the most incredible rumors of the immoral and blasphemous character of the secret rites and ceremonies of the society were spread abroad. Its crimes were declared "sufficient to move the earth and disturb the elements."

Taking advantage of the feeling against the order, Philip resolved upon its destruction. He was moved doubtless by various motives. First, he disliked the secret character of the society, and since its members regarded themselves as subjects of the pope rather than as subjects of the king of France, it stood in the way of the creation of a unified state. Second, it is possible that he feared the order might imitate the example of the order of Teutonic Knights and set up somewhere in France — its possessions and influence were very great in Languedoc — an independent principality. Third, his desperate need of money led him to covet the wealth of the order. Beyond all question it was the riches of the society, and not its sins, that were the real cause of its undoing.

The blow fell suddenly. Upon a preconcerted day (Oct. 13, 1307) the chiefs of the order throughout the kingdom were arrested, and many of them afterwards put to death on various charges, among which were heresy, the betrayal of the cause of Christianity to the Moslems, and spitting upon the Cross.

Some of the accused confessed — under torture, however, administered by the officers of the Inquisition — that in certain of their secret ceremonies they did spit upon the sacred emblem, but explained the act as being symbolical, "in imitation and remembrance of Saint Peter, who thrice denied Christ." But it seems evident that the symbolical character of the act had become quite forgotten, and that it was sometimes performed with unbecoming levity. Nevertheless, the charges as respects the order as a whole were absurd, and the evidence relied upon to prove them true was wholly inadequate.[19]

The great crime brought to Philip vast wealth. Besides the cancellation of an enormous debt which he owed the order for borrowed money, he acquired its personal property, — a large treasure, — and all its manors and houses situated in France, although these landed estates at a later time went to the Hospitalers. The wealth thus gained by Philip greatly enhanced the growing power and patronage of the crown, just as the strength and influence of Henry VIII of England were vastly increased by the confiscated wealth of the religious houses he suppressed; while the successful issue of his attack upon such a powerful organization served to inspire universal fear and respect for the royal name.

France under the Mediæval Valois (1328–1498).

344. General Statement. — The house of Valois,[20] as already pointed out, was a branch of the Capetian family. The dynasty came to the throne in 1328, and ruled during the remainder of the mediæval time and well on into the modern age.

[19] The order was formally abolished in 1312 by Pope Clement V, the first of the Avignon popes, who was wholly under the influence of Philip.

[20] The following table exhibits the names of the mediæval Valois kings:

Philip VI.	1328–1350	Charles VII (the Victorious)	1422–1461
John (the Good) . . .	1350–1364	Louis XI	1461–1483
Charles V (the Wise) .	1364–1380	Charles VIII (the Affable)	1483–1498
Charles VI (the Well-Beloved)	1380–1422		

The main interest of the period of French history upon which we here enter attaches to that long struggle between England and France known as the Hundred Years' War, although it really lasted one hundred and fifteen years, thus extending over a great part of the age of the mediæval Valois kings. Having already, in connection with English affairs, touched upon the causes and incidents of this war, we shall here speak only of the effects of the struggle on the French people and kingdom.

345. Effects upon France of the Hundred Years' War. — Among the results for France of the Hundred Years' War must be noticed the almost complete prostration, by the successive shocks of Crécy, Poitiers, and Agincourt, of the French feudal aristocracy, which was already tottering to its fall through various undermining influences; the growth of the power of the king, a consequence, largely, of the ruin of the nobility; and, lastly, the awakening of a feeling of nationality, and the drawing together of the hitherto isolated sections of the country by the attraction of a common and patriotic enthusiasm.

Speaking in a very general manner, we may say that by the close of the war feudalism in France was over, and that France had become, partly in spite of the war but more largely by reason of it, not only a great monarchy but a great nation.[21]

346. Louis XI and Charles the Bold of Burgundy. — The foundations of the French monarchy, laid and cemented in the way we have seen, were greatly enlarged and strengthened by the unscrupulous measures of Louis XI (1461–1483), who was a perfect Ulysses in cunning and deceit. His maxim was, "He who does not know how to dissimulate does not know

[21] During this period of confusion many fiefs were unjustly seized by the king, while others again were justly forfeited to the crown. The royal domains were still further enlarged by the purchase of territory that had never been held feudally of the French king. Thus, in 1349, Humbert II, count of Vienne, sold Philip VI, for 120,000 florins, the important province of Dauphiné, in the Lower Rhone region. One of the conditions of the grant was that the eldest son of the French king should take the title of *Dauphin*, which was thenceforth borne by the heir of the French throne.

how to reign." Because of the subtile web of diplomacy which he so tirelessly and unpityingly spun, he was called the "universal spider." The great feudal lords that still retained power and influence he brought to destruction one after another, and united their fiefs to the royal domains.

Of all the vassal nobles ruined by the craft of Louis, the most renowned and powerful was Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy. Charles was endeavoring, out of a great patchwork of petty feudal states and semi-independent cantons and cities, to build up a kingdom between Germany and France. His success in this effort would have meant practically a restoration of the old Lotharingian kingdom, which, it will be recalled, stretched across Europe from the Mediterranean to the North Sea.[22]

It seems one of the misfortunes of history that Charles did not succeed in his ambition. The formation of such a "middle kingdom" to serve as a barrier state between France and Germany would have changed greatly not only the map of Europe but the entire political history of the continent.

For some of his lands Charles paid homage, or at least owed homage, to the king of France; others he held as fiefs of the Holy Roman Empire. It is easy to understand how these relations of Charles and his known ambitions should have set him apart as one whom his wily neighbor Louis would watch closely. Louis was frequently warring with the duke, and forever intriguing against him.

Upon the death of the duke — he was killed in 1477 in a battle with the Swiss — Louis, without clear right, seized a considerable part of his dominions.

By cession and by inheritance Louis also added to France important lands in the south (Provence, Roussillon, and Cerdagne), which gave the French kingdom a wider frontage upon the Mediterranean, and made the Pyrenees its southern defense.

[22] See map, p. 130.

347. Invasion of Italy by Charles VIII. — Charles VIII (1483–1498), son and successor of Louis XI, was the last of the direct line of the Valois. Through his marriage to Anne of Brittany, he brought that great fief, which had hitherto constituted an almost independent state, under the direct rule of the crown.

Thus through the favor of a long series of circumstances, the persistent policy of his predecessors, and his own politic marriage, Charles found himself at the head of a kingdom which, gradually transformed from a feudal league into a true monarchy, had, by slow expansion, touched upon almost every side those limits which were to constitute substantially the boundaries of modern France.

Charles was a romantic youth. His extravagant fancy led him to dream of some brilliant and chivalric enterprise which should draw the gaze of the world, and which might contribute to the realization of his great project of making France instead of Germany the head of the world-empire. The standing army at his command, — which had been regularly organized during the latter years of the war with England, — a well-filled treasury, and the adulation of his courtier nobles encouraged him in his wild ambition.

Purchasing by reckless cessions of territory the acquiescence of the rival and jealous houses of Aragon and Austria in his plans of an Italian expedition, Charles gathered an army of fifty thousand men and began the passage of the Alps, intent on the conquest of the kingdom of Naples, his claim to which was derived from the house of Anjou.[28] With Naples in his possession, he proposed to perform the imperial duty of leading a crusade to the East for the recovery of Constantinople and Jerusalem from the hands of the Turks.

Charles's march through Italy was a mere "promenade." In the early spring of the year 1495 he entered Naples in triumph. Here, in the midst of splendid ceremonies, he

[28] See par. 366, n. 30.

caused himself to be crowned "King of Naples, Sicily, and Jerusalem."

Meanwhile the king of Aragon, the Venetians, and other powers were uniting their armies to punish the insolence and check the vaulting ambition of the would-be emperor and crusader. Apprised of the movements of his enemies, Charles, deferring until a more convenient time his Eastern expedition, set out on his return to France, leaving a small force at Naples to hold his conquests. In Northern Italy he found his way blocked by the allies with an army outnumbering his three to one. However, he secured what he called a victory over his opposers, but bought it at the cost of a large part of his army. With the remnant he made good his retreat into France. The forces he had left at Naples were quickly driven out of the place, and thus ended Charles's dream of a universal French empire.

This enterprise of Charles is noteworthy not only because it marks the commencement of a long series of brilliant yet disastrous campaigns carried on by the French in Italy, but for the reason that in a more general way it foreshadows that aggrandizing and aggressive spirit that henceforth characterizes the foreign policy of the successive monarchs of France. It is further worthy of attention on account of Charles's army having been made up largely of paid troops instead of feudal retainers, which fact assures us that the feudal system, as a military organization, had practically come to an end.

Formation of the French Language and the Beginnings of French Literature

348. **The Language.** — The contact of the old Latin speech in Gaul with that of the Teutonic invaders gave rise there to two very distinct dialects, dialects so unlike, indeed, that it would be quite correct to regard them as constituting two separate languages. These were the *Langue d'Oc*, or Provençal,

the tongue of the South of France and of the adjoining regions of Spain and Italy; and the *Langue d'Oïl*, or French proper, the language of the North.[24]

The soft, musical tongue of the South, predestined though it was to an early decay, was the first, as we shall learn in a moment, to develop a literature; but when the North precipitated itself upon the South in the furious crusades against the Albigenses, the language, literature, and heretical religion of these southern provinces were all swept away together. As the persecuted faith was driven into obscurity, so in like manner the old speech was driven out of palace and court, and found a place only among the rude peasantry.

The position of this once widely used Provençal speech among living languages may be illustrated by comparing its fortunes with those of the Celtic tongue in its conflict with the Anglo-Saxon in the British Isles.

349. The Troubadours. — About the beginning of the twelfth century, by which time the Provençal tongue had become settled and somewhat polished, literature in France first began to find a voice in the songs of the Troubadours,[25] the poets of the South. It is instructive to note that it was the home of the Albigensian heresy, the land that had felt the influence of every Mediterranean civilization, that was also the home of the Troubadour literature. The counts of Toulouse, the protectors of the heretics, were also the patrons of the poets. It was, as we have intimated, the same fierce persecution which uprooted the heretical faith that stilled the song of the Troubadours.

The compositions of the Troubadours were, for the most part, love-songs and satires. Among the countless minstrels of the South were some who acquired a fame which was spread

[24] The terms *Langue d'Oc* and *Langue d'Oïl* arose from the use of different words for "yes," which in the tongue of the South was *oc*, and in that of the North *oïl*.

[25] From the Provençal *trobar*, to find, to invent. The northern poets were called *Trouveurs*, from the French *trouver*, meaning the same as *trobar*.

throughout Christendom. Richard Cœur de Lion composed some songs which still endure. But perhaps the greatest of all the Provençal poets was Bertrand de Born, who sang of war as well as of love, and whose fierce and vehement verses stirred up passions and strife. Because of the mischief and schism he wrought, Dante, in his *Divine Comedy*, pictures him among the tormented in Hell, where he is condemned to bear his severed head in his own hands.

The verses of the Troubadours were sung in every land, and to their stimulating influence the early poetry of almost every people of Europe is largely indebted.

350. The Trouveurs. — These were the poets of Northern France, who composed in the *Langue d'Oïl*, or Old French tongue. They flourished during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. As the poetical literature of the South found worthy patrons in the counts of Toulouse, so did that of the North find admiring encouragers in the dukes of Normandy.

There was, however, a wide difference between the literature of Southern and that of Northern France. The compositions of the Troubadours were almost exclusively lyric songs, while those of the Trouveurs were chiefly epic or narrative poems, called *romances*. These latter celebrated the chivalrous exploits and loves of great princes and knights, and displayed at times almost Homeric animation and grandeur. Many of them gather about three familiar names, — Charles the Great, King Arthur, and Alexander the Great, — thus forming what are designated as the cycle of Charlemagne, the Arthurian or Armorican cycle, and the Alexandrian.

The poems of these several epic cycles not only celebrate the wars and amorous adventures of the distinguished heroes whose names they bear, but also rehearse the chivalric deeds of their vassal knights and descendants. Thus, in the stirring *Song of Roland*, in the first cycle, are celebrated the deeds of Roland (the companion of Charles the Great), who cleaves the Pyrenees with one blow of his enchanted sword Durandal,

and shakes all the earth with a single blast of his magic horn; in the romances of the Knights of the Round Table, in the second cycle, are told the chivalrous enterprises of the companions of good King Arthur; while in the *History of the taking of Troy* and the *Romance of Alexander*, in the third series, we have Greek and mediæval heroes and legends mixed in the most entertaining and ingenious confusion.[26]

The extravagance, the credulity, the coarseness that mark much of this romantic literature, indicate the rude and uncritical character of the age that produced and applauded it. Yet, notwithstanding these defects, inseparable from the literary products of an age still struggling with barbarian instincts and impulses, the influence of these French romances upon the springing literatures of Europe was most inspiring and helpful. Nor has their influence yet ceased. Thus in English literature, not only did Chaucer and Spenser and all the early island poets draw inspiration from these fountains of Continental song, but the later Tennyson, in his *Idyls of the King*, has illustrated the power over the imagination yet possessed by the Arthurian poems of the old Trouveurs.

Besides the great narrative poems of the Trouveurs, the literature of the North produced innumerable allegories and *fabliaux*, or fables. Some of these are of almost endless length, containing thirty or forty thousand lines. They were produced in somewhat the same way as the cathedrals of the same age were built, — by the additions of generation after generation of poets. The most popular of the allegories was the *Roman de la Rose*, which reflects as does no other mediæval poem the ideas and feelings of the common people. The most celebrated of the fabliaux was the *Roman du Reynart*, or *Reynard the Fox*, which was in large part a satire on

[26] These epics, it will be noticed, represent the three elements in the civilization of Western Europe, the German, the Celtic, and the Græco-Roman. It was the Crusades that brought in a fresh relay of tales and legends from the lands of the East. Cf par. 226.

monk and knight. It heralded the decay of the spirit both of chivalry and of monasticism.

351. Froissart's Chronicles. — The first really noted prose writer in French literature was Froissart (about 1337–1410), whose picturesqueness of style and skill as a story-teller have won for him the title of the French Herodotus. Born, as he was, only a little after the opening of the Hundred Years' War, and knowing personally many of the actors in that long struggle, it was fitting that he should have become, as he did, the annalist of those stirring times. In his charming *Chronicles* he has left us the most wonderfully lifelike portraitures of the celebrated characters, both French and English, of that period, as well as the most vivid pictures that we possess of the scenes, customs, and manners of the age.

Like Herodotus, Froissart was a great traveler, going about everywhere to collect material for his history, which, while dealing chiefly with the affairs of France and England from 1326 to 1400, touches upon the matters of all Christendom, and of other parts of the world besides. He talked with everybody, with kings and with peasants, and wrote down at night what had been told him during the day. The book was his life work; he began it, he tells us, at the age of twenty, and in the collection of material for it "took greater pleasure than in anything else."

The inimitable *Chronicles* have an added value from the age in which they were written. It was, as we have learned, a transition period. Feudalism was fast passing away, and chivalry was beginning to feel the dissolving breath of a new era. But as the forests never clothe themselves in more gorgeous colors than when already touched by decay, so chivalry never arrayed itself in more splendid magnificence than when about to die. In the age of Edward III and the Black Prince it displayed its most sumptuous and prodigal splendor. And this is the age which the rare genius of Froissart has painted for us.[27]

[27] The most worthy predecessors of Froissart in the field of vernacular historical writing were Villehardouin (about 1160–1213), whose attractive chronicle


AQUITAINE
FRANCE
BURGUNDY
R. Rhone
LEON
CASTILE
NAVARRE
ARAGON
PORTUGAL
Oviedo
Compostella
R. Minho
Portugale
Coimbra
R. Douro
Burgos
Tudela
Pampeluna
Zaragoza
Lerida
R. Ebro
Toulouse
Alby
Nimes
Carcassonne
Rousillon
Narbonne
BARCELONA
Gerona
Barcelona
PROVENCE
Arles
Marseilles
Pisa
ITALY
CORSICA
ROME
Gaeta
Amalfi
SARDINIA
MINORCA
MAJORCA
IVIZA
Valencia
Murcia
Carthagena
Toledo
R. Tagus
LISBON
Elena
Jaen
Cordova
Seville
Granada
Malaga
Almeria
Algeziras
Ceuta
Tangier
R. Guadalquivir
R. Guadiana
Palermo
Messina
SICILY
Catania
Girgenti
Syracuse
MALTA
Bona
Tunis
Kairwan
El Mehdija
ALGIERS
THE
SPANISH KINGDOMS
1210.
Musulmans
Leon
Navarre
France and French Fiefs
Portugal
Aragon & Fiefs held by Aragon
Castile

III. Spain

352. The Beginnings of Spain. — When, in the eighth century, the Saracens swept like a wave over Spain, the mountains of Asturias and Cantabria in the northwest corner of the peninsula afforded a refuge for the most resolute of the Christian chiefs who refused to submit their necks to the Moslem yoke. These brave and hardy warriors not only successfully defended the hilly districts that formed their asylum, but gradually pushed back the invaders, and regained control of a portion of the fields and cities that had been lost.

This work of reconquest was greatly furthered by Charles the Great, who, it will be recalled, drove the Saracens out of all the northeastern portion of the country as far south as the Ebro, and made the subjugated district a province of his empire, under the name of the Spanish March.

By the opening of the eleventh century several little Christian states, among which we must notice especially the states of Castile and Aragon because of the prominent part they were to play in later history, had been established upon the ground thus recovered or always maintained. Castile was at first simply "a line of castles" against the Moors, whence its name.

353. Union of Castile and Aragon (1479). — For several centuries the princes of the little states to which we have referred kept up an incessant warfare with their Mohammedan neighbors; but, owing to dissensions among themselves, they were unable to combine in any effective way for the complete reconquest of their ancient possessions. But the marriage, in 1469, of Ferdinand, prince of Aragon, to Isabella, princess of Castile, paved the way for the virtual union in 1479 of these

entitled *The Conquest of Constantinople* is one of the earliest specimens of French prose; and Joinville (1224–1319), who left behind his entertaining *Life of St. Louis*. Following Froissart in the next century was Philippe de Commines (about 1447–1511), whose *Memoirs*, besides being a good history of his times, give us a valuable insight into the life and character of the crafty Louis XI.

two leading states, both greatly enlarged since the eleventh century, into a single kingdom. By this happy union the quarrels of these two rival principalities were composed, and they were now free to employ their united strength in effecting what the Christian princes amidst all their contentions had never lost sight of, — the expulsion of the Moors from the peninsula.

354. The Conquest of Granada (1492). — At the time when the basis of the Spanish monarchy was laid by the union of Castile and Aragon, the Mohammedan possessions had been reduced, by the constant pressure of the Christian chiefs through eight centuries, to a very limited dominion in the south of Spain. Here the Moors had established a strong, well-compacted state, known as the kingdom of Granada.

The province of Granada, naturally fertile, had become, through the industry and skill of the Moors, one of the best cultivated and richest districts in Spain. It embraced within its narrow limits seventy walled towns besides the capital, Granada, a potent and opulent city, with a population of almost a quarter of a million. All these cities, particularly the capital, were enriched with superb specimens of Moorish architecture, many of the palaces of the wealthy being decorated with fabulous magnificence.

As soon as Ferdinand and Isabella had settled the affairs of their dominions, they began to make preparation for the conquest of Granada, eager to signalize their reign by the reduction of this last stronghold of the Moorish power in the peninsula.

The Moors made a desperate defense of their little state. The struggle lasted for ten years. City after city fell into the hands of the Christian knights, and finally Granada, pressed by an army of seventy thousand, was forced to surrender, and the Cross replaced the Crescent on its walls and towers (1492). The Moors, or Moriscos, as they were called, were allowed to remain in the country, though under many annoying restrictions. What is known as their *expulsion* occurred at a later date.


THE
SPANISH KINGDOMS
1360.
Musulmans
Navarre
Castile and Leon
France
Portugal
Aragon
Toulouse
Carcassonne
Narbonne
Rousillon
Nimes
Arles
Marseilles
PROVENCE
Pampeluna
Burgos
Zaragoza
Lerida
Gerona
Barcelona
Tudela
Oviedo
Compostella
ASTURIAS
GALICIA
Portucale
Coimbra
OLD CASTILE
NEW CASTILE
Toledo
LEON
CATALONIA
R. Ebro
Valencia
MINORCA
MAJORCA
IVIZA
SARDINIA
Cagliari
CORSICA
Pisa
ROME
Gaeta
Amalfi
Palermo
Messina
SICILY
Catania
Girgenti
Terra Nova
Syracuse
MALTA
Bona
Tunis
Kairwan
El Mehdija
LISBON
CORDOVA
JAEN
Elena
Cordova
Jaen
Seville
Murcia
Carthagena
Granada
Malaga
Almeria
Algeziras
Gibraltar
Tangier
Ceuta
ALGARVE
Silves
R. Guadalquivir
R. Guadiana
R. Tagus
R. Minho
R. Douro
AQUITAINE
R. Rhone
10
5
0
5
10
15
45
40
35

The fall of Granada holds an important place among the many significant events that mark the latter half of the fifteenth century. It marked the end, after an existence of almost eight hundred years, of Mohammedan rule in the Spanish peninsula, and thus formed an offset to the progress of the Moslem power in Eastern Europe and the loss to the Christian world of Constantinople. It advanced Spain to a place among the foremost nations of Europe, and gave her arms a prestige that secured for her position, influence, and deference long after the decline of her power had commenced.

355. Influence upon the Spanish Character of the Moorish Domination and the Moorish Wars. — The long wars which the Spanish Christians waged against the Arab Moors left a deep impress upon the national character. In the first place, the opportunity which they afforded for knightly service and romantic adventure heightened that chivalrous spirit of which more than traces are noticeable in the feelings and the bearing of the Spaniard of to-day. In the second place, they made religion a thing of patriotism, and thus aroused religious zeal and fostered the growth of intolerance.

But the development of this fervid religious spirit was furthered not alone by the long active warfare between Christian and Moslem; it was nourished even during the years of peace by the persecutions to which the Christians living under Moslem rule were much of the time subjected by bigoted emirs and caliphs. "The Christians," to use the words of the historian Martin Hume, ". . . met bigotry with bigotry; and the feeling of the two races toward each other, which at first was sympathetic, grew in time to the passionate loathing which we shall see existing in the last days of the domination." The unfortunate bias and temper thus imparted to the Spanish national character set Spain apart from the other Western nations, and affords the key to much of her later history, both in Europe and in the New World.

For illustration, it was, without doubt, the development in

the Spanish people of this fierce uncompromising religious spirit that helped to prepare the ground in Spain for the setting up there of the terrible tribunal of the Inquisition, of which we shall come to speak in a moment.

356. Growth of the Royal Power. — One matter of great importance marking the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella was the abridging of the privileges of the nobility and the consequent enhancement of the authority of the crown. In no country of Europe was the power of the feudal lords greater than in Spain, nor did any country suffer more from their rapacious and quarrelsome character.

For the sake of protection against the nobles, — and also against the brigands who had sprung up under the anarchy induced throughout the country by the wretched administration of justice under the feudal system, — the towns and cities had formed a league, known as the Holy Brotherhood, a confederation somewhat like that of the Hanseatic League of Germany.

By joining with these cities against the aristocracy, Ferdinand forced the nobles to give up certain of their unjust privileges, and thus greatly weakened their power. He further undermined the influence and strength of many of the great feudal houses by securing decrees of court which took away from them lands which had been too freely conferred upon unworthy favorites by his feeble predecessors, much to the prejudice of the crown, and by bestowing dignities and offices upon persons outside of the ranks of the ancient nobility.

In these and other ways Ferdinand greatly enhanced the royal power and raised the kingly office in popular estimation and respect.

357. The Inquisition. — Another matter belonging to this period, and a thing which casts a dark shadow upon the reign of the illustrious sovereigns Ferdinand and Isabella, was the establishment in Spain of the Inquisition, or Holy Office, *with a view* to the detection and punishment of heresy.

Being employed by the government for the securing of political as well as religious ends, the Inquisition became an instrument of the most incredible tyranny. The Jews were in this earlier period the chief victims of the tribunal. Accompanying the announcement of the sentences of the Holy Office there were solemn public ceremonies known as the *auto de fe* ("act of faith"). The assembly was held in some church or in the public square, and the following day those condemned to death were burned outside the city walls. It is particularly to this last act of the drama that the term *auto de fe* has come popularly to be applied.

The Inquisition secured for Spain unity of religious belief, but only through suppressing freedom of thought, and thereby sapping the strength and virility of the Spanish people. Whatever was most promising and vigorous was withered and blasted, or was cast out. In the year 1492 the Jews were expelled from the country. It is estimated that between two and three hundred thousand of this race were forced to seek an asylum in other lands.

Thus at the same time that Ferdinand and Isabella were doing so much to foster the national life, their unfortunate religious zeal was planting the upas tree which was destined completely to overshadow and poison the springing energies of the nation. Yet in all this Queen Isabella sincerely believed she was rendering God good service. "In the love of Christ and his Maid-Mother," she said, "I have caused great misery. I have depopulated towns and districts, provinces and kingdoms."

358. Columbus given his Commission (1492). — Still another matter pertaining to the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, an event of the very greatest significance to Spain as well as to civilization, was the discovery of America; for the very year which saw the fall of Granada was the one that witnessed the first expedition of Columbus.

Isabella, while encamped with her army beneath the walls of Granada, — for the energetic queen accompanied her

soldiers to the field and took an active part in directing the operations of war, — was planning with Columbus his great enterprise; and it was only a few days after the downfall of Granada that she gave to him that fortunate commission which added a New World to the Spanish crown.

359. Death of Ferdinand and Isabella. — Queen Isabella died in 1504, and Ferdinand followed her in the year 1516, upon which latter event the crown of Spain descended to his grandson, Charles, of whom we shall hear much hereafter as the Emperor Charles V. With his reign the modern history of Spain begins.[28]

Beginnings of the Spanish Language and Literature

360. The Language. — After the union of Castile and Aragon it was the language of the former that became the speech of the Spanish court. During the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella it gradually gained ascendency over the numerous dialects of the country and became at last the national speech, just as in France the *Langue d'Oïl* finally crowded out all other dialects. By the conquests and colonizations of the sixteenth century this Castilian speech was destined to become only less widely spread than is the English tongue.

361. The Poem of the Cid. — Castilian or Spanish literature begins in the twelfth century with the romance poem of the *Cid*, one of the best-known literary productions of the mediæval period. This grand national poem was the outgrowth of the sentiments inspired by the long struggle between the Spanish

[28] Portugal, the beginnings of which during the crusading period we have already noticed (par. 219), did not become a part of the larger peninsular monarchy, but remained an independent state. It acquired the dignity of a kingdom in the twelfth century. The chief interest of its history during the fifteenth century centers in the voyages of discovery of the Portuguese sailors down the western coast of Africa. The inspiring spirit of these undertakings was the renowned Prince Henry the Navigator (1394–1460). An account of these explorations will find a place in the opening chapter of the volume which is to follow this on the history of the Modern Age.

Christians and the Mohammedan Moors. The hero of the epic is Ruy Diaz, surnamed the Cid (meaning probably "lord"), the champion of Christianity and Castilian royalty, during the latter part of the eleventh century, against the Saracens. He is made by the romancers, through a long process of idealization, to be the impersonation of every knightly virtue, — generosity, patriotism, courage, truthfulness, honor, and loyalty. The real Cid was quite a different character.

The influence of the romance of the *Cid* in exciting the sentiment of Spanish patriotism and in stimulating the spirit of Spanish nationality has been likened to the effects of the poems of Homer in creating fraternal bonds between the cities of ancient Hellas. But it was in truth both cause and effect; Spanish sentiment created the ideal, and then made it a model.

IV. Germany

362. Beginnings of the Kingdom of Germany. — The history of Germany as a separate kingdom begins with the break-up of the empire of Charles the Great, about the middle of the ninth century.[29] The part to the east of the Rhine, with which fragment alone we are now specially concerned, was called the *Kingdom of the Eastern Franks*, in distinction from that to the west of the river, which was known as the *Kingdom of the Western Franks*.

This Eastern Frankish kingdom was made up of several groups of tribes, — the Saxons, the Suabians, the Thuringians, the Bavarians, and the East Franks, of which the latter were at this time chief, and gave name to the whole. Closely allied in race, speech, manners, and social arrangements, all these peoples seemed ready to be welded into a close and firm nation; but, unfortunately, the circumstances tending to keep

[29] Cf. par. 106. After the partition treaty of 843 the three kingdoms created by that arrangement were, it is true, united again in 887 under a single head, but the union was such only in appearance and lasted less than a year.

the several tribes, or communities, apart were stronger than those operating to draw them together, so that for more than a thousand years after Charles the Great we find them constituting hardly anything more than a very loose confederation, the members of which were constantly struggling among themselves for supremacy, or were engaged in private wars with the neighboring nations.

363. Founding of the State of Hungary. — The descendants of Charles the Great ruled over the Eastern Franks until the year 911. During this period Germany was distressed on the north by the Scandinavian corsairs, and on the east by the Magyars, or Hungarians, a fierce Turanian race, akin, as we have already learned, to the Huns of Attila. This non-Aryan people succeeded during this period in gaining permanent possession of the region known from them as Hungary, and in laying the foundations there of a strong kingdom, which was eventually to become an important part of the great modern state of Austria-Hungary.

364. Revival of the Empire by Otto the Great (962); **Consequences to Germany of its Renewal.** — We have in another place, while tracing the history of the empire, told how Otto I (936–973) of Germany, in imitation of Charles the Great, restored the imperial authority (par. 108).

Otto's scheme respecting the establishment of a world-empire was a grand one, but, as had been demonstrated by the failure of the attempt of the great Charles, was an utterly impracticable ideal. Yet the pursuit of this phantom by the German kings resulted in the most woeful consequences to Germany. Trying to grasp too much, the German rulers seized nothing at all. Attempting to be emperors of the world, they failed to become even kings of Germany. While they were engaged in outside enterprises, their home affairs were neglected, and the vassal princes of Germany succeeded in increasing their power and making themselves practically independent.

Thus while the kings of England, France, and Spain were gradually consolidating their dominions and building up strong centralized monarchies on the ruins of feudalism, the preoccupied sovereigns of Germany were allowing it to become split up into a great number of semi-independent states, the ambitions and jealousies of whose rulers were to postpone the unification of Germany for several hundred years — until our own day.

Had the emperors inflicted loss and disaster upon Germany alone through this misdirection of their energies, the case would not be so lamentable; but the fair fields of Italy were for centuries made the camping fields of the imperial armies, and the whole peninsula was kept embroiled with the quarrels of Guelphs and Ghibellines, and thus the nationalization of the Italian people was also delayed for centuries.

Germany received just one positive compensation for all this loss accruing from the ambition of her kings. This was the gift of Italian civilization, which came into Germany through the connections of the emperors with the peninsula.

365. The German Kingdom and the Holy Roman Empire. — It will be well, perhaps, if we add one word further respecting the relation of the German kingdom to the Holy Roman Empire. The "Empire," after the addition to it of Burgundy in 1032, embraced three kingdoms, the kingdom of Germany, the kingdom of Italy, and the kingdom of Burgundy. But in the course of time Italy dropped away, and then Burgundy fell off, until nothing save the German kingdom remained. Then, of course, the German kingdom and the so-called Holy Roman Empire had the same boundaries — were geographically identical. Hence it was natural that the distinction should be forgotten and the names confounded, to the extent that the German kingdom should come to be called the German empire. "It was a German confederation, which kept the forms and titles of the Empire."

366. Germany under the Hohenstaufen Emperors (1138–1254). — The matter of chief importance during the rule of

the Hohenstaufen or Suabian house was, as we have learned, the long and bitter conflict waged between the emperors of this family and the popes.

The name of the most noted of the Hohenstaufen emperors — Frederick Barbarossa — is familiar to us. Frederick gave Germany a good and strong government, and gained a sure place in the affections of the German people, who came to regard him as the representative of the sentiment of German nationality. Other emperors, when engaged in contentions with the pope, always had a great many among their own German subjects ready to join the Roman see against their own sovereign; but all classes in Germany gathered about their beloved Frederick. When news of his death was brought back from the East they refused to believe that their "knightly emperor" was dead, and, as time passed, a legend arose which told how he slept in a cavern beneath one of his castles on a mountain top, and how, when the ravens should cease to circle about the hill, he would appear, to make the German people a nation united and strong.

Frederick Barbarossa was followed by his son Henry VI (1190–1197), who, by marriage, had acquired a claim to the kingdom of Sicily.[30] Almost all his time and resources were spent in attempts to reduce that remote realm to a state of proper subjection to his authority. By leading the emperors

[30] The basis of the kingdom of Sicily, it will be recalled, was laid by Norman adventurers in the latter part of the eleventh century (par. 166). As it embraced Naples as well as the island of Sicily, it was sometimes called the kingdom of Naples, or the kingdom of Naples and Sicily, or, again, the kingdom of the Two Sicilies. The line of the Norman kings ended in 1189. The Hohenstaufen then held the kingdom until 1265, when the pope gave it as a fief to Charles I of Anjou (brother of Louis IX of France), who beheaded the rightful heir, the ill-starred boy Conradin, the last of the Hohenstaufen race (1268). Charles's oppressive rule led to a revolt of his island subjects, and to the great massacre known as the Sicilian Vespers (1282). All the hated race of Frenchmen were either killed or driven out of the island. The house of Anjou retained Naples, but Sicily now passed to the king of Aragon (1283). In these revolutions the way was paved for interminable dynastic quarrels and wars, which involved particularly Spain, France, and Germany.

to neglect their German subjects and interests, this southern kingdom proved a fatal dower to the Suabian house.

By the close of the Hohenstaufen period Germany was divided between two and three hundred virtually independent states, the princes and the cities having taken advantage of the prolonged absences of the emperors, or their troubles with the popes and the Italian cities, to free themselves almost completely from the control of the crown. There was really no longer either a German kingdom or a Holy Roman Empire. The royal as well as the imperial title had become an empty name.

Such were the lamentable consequences of the unfortunate ambition and mistaken policy of the proud Hohenstaufen. The princes of the house were all able rulers, some of them exceptionally strong and large-minded men, and had they simply attended to the affairs of Germany, and not allowed themselves to be deluded by the imperial phantom, they might have made themselves the strongest sovereigns in Europe. They would have been able, doubtless, to realize the less dazzling but more substantial ambition of rendering the German crown hereditary in their family, and thus have gained for their race the power and glory that came to be won by the house of Hapsburg.

367. Cathedral-Building. — The age of the Hohenstaufen was the age of the Crusades, which is to say that it was the age of religious faith. The most striking expression of the spirit of the period, if we except the Holy Wars, is to be found in the sacred architecture of the times. The enthusiasm for church-building, though most earnest and passionate in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, began to manifest itself as early as the eleventh. A monkish chronicler, writing at the opening of that century, says, "It was as if the earth, rousing itself and casting away its old robes, clothed itself with the white garment of churches."

The style of architecture first employed was the Romanesque, characterized by the rounded arch and the dome; but

towards the close of the twelfth century this was superseded by the Gothic, distinguished by the pointed arch, the slender spire, and rich ornamentation.

The mediæval cathedrals were, like the Crusades, the outgrowth of a faith and enthusiasm that animated all classes alike. Many of the structures were the result of the united toil of generation after generation. The expense was met in various ways. Rich monasteries made large contributions; city councils voted constant appropriations; kings made grants, or exempted from taxation cities and provinces that would undertake the erection of a church or a cathedral; while the bequests of the dying, and the free offerings of the people, in labor and products, swelled the streams of contribution.

Nothing is more expressive of the aspiring religious spirit than the mediæval Gothic cathedral. In every part it is instinct with the faith and hope of the builder. It is a prayer, a holy aspiration in stone.

The enthusiasm, we have said, was universal; yet nowhere did it find nobler or more sustained expression than in Germany. Among the most noted of the German cathedrals are the one at Strasburg, begun in the eleventh century, and that at Cologne, commenced in 1248, but not finished until our own day (1880). The latter is one of the most imposing monuments of Gothic architecture in the world.

368. The Seven Electors; the Interregnum (1254–1273). — In order to make intelligible the transactions of that period in German history known as the Interregnum, which we have now reached, we must here say a word about the Electors of the empire.

When, in the beginning of the tenth century, the German Carolingian line became extinct the great nobles of the kingdom assumed the right of choosing the successor of the last of the house, and Germany thus became an elective feudal monarchy. In the course of time a few of the leading nobles

usurped the right of choosing the king, and these princes became known as Electors. There were, at the end of the Hohenstaufen period, seven princes who enjoyed this important privilege, four of whom were secular princes and three spiritual. This electoral body really held the destinies of Germany in its hands.[81]

We are now in a position to understand the most shameful transaction of the sale of the German crown. The Electors, like the pretorians of ancient Rome, put the bauble up for sale. There were two bidders, both foreigners, Richard of Cornwall, brother of the English king, Henry III, and Alphonso, king of Castile. Both candidates offered to the Electors large bribes, and so both were elected — one of the Electors voting for both candidates. Although Alphonso had manifested so much anxiety to secure the honor, he never once set foot within the limits of Germany, and Richard contented himself with an occasional visit to the country.

Of course neither of the nominal kings, or emperors-elect, possessed any real authority in Germany, or in any of the countries claimed as parts of the empire. The period is known in German history as the Interregnum. Anarchy prevailed throughout the country. Princes made themselves petty despots in their dominions, while the lesser nobles became robbers and preyed upon traders.

369. Towns and Free Imperial Cities. — The kingly power having fallen into such utter contempt that all general government was practically in abeyance, the towns, which through

[81] The claims of the Electors were very naturally disputed by some of the other members of the Germanic body. In order to settle the matter forever, the Luxemburg emperor Charles IV (1347–1378), having first secured the action of a Diet, promulgated a decree called, from its golden seal, the Golden Bull, which confirmed the right of election in the princes (three ecclesiastical and four secular) who then exercised it, and defined clearly the powers and privileges of the electoral college. This bull remained the fundamental law of the German constitution so long as the empire lasted — until 1806. It greatly enhanced the dignity and power of the Seven Electors, and proportionately weakened the royal or imperial authority.

the gradual expansion of their trade had grown vastly in population, wealth, and consequent importance, found it necessary, in order to protect themselves against the violence and oppression of the princes and barons, to form confederations and take their defense in their own hands. It was during this anarchical period that the Hanseatic League, of which we gave an account in an earlier chapter, grew rapidly in strength and influence. About the same time that this confederation was established there was formed the important Rhenish League, which finally came to embrace more than seventy towns.

The towns were divided into two classes, designated as "mediate" and "immediate." The first depended upon some prince or lord, who was in turn dependent upon the emperor. The second were dependent solely upon the emperor — were his immediate vassals. In these latter cities the emperor was represented by a special officer, but during the course of the thirteenth century many of these immediate towns, through the favor of their suzerain, were relieved of the presence of the imperial bailiff and became what are known as free imperial cities. They of course still acknowledged the suzerainty of the emperor, but were allowed to manage their local affairs to suit themselves, and thus became practically little commonwealths, somewhat like the city-republics of Italy.

A century or two after these cities had secured freedom from the imperial superintendence they acquired the right of representation in the Diet, or national legislative body. This was the natural consequence of their growing power, just as in England the increasing weight of the towns led, in the thirteenth century, to the admission of their representatives to Parliament. These deputies of the free imperial cities constituted what was known as the "Third College" of the national assembly.

370. Rise of the Swiss Republic. — The most noteworthy matters in German history during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are the struggle between the Swiss and the princes

Western Empire
France
England
House of Austrid
Brandenburg
House of Luzemburg
Savoy
Swiss Confedn.
CENTRAL EUROPE
1360.
DENMARK
PRUSSIA
POMERANIA
MECKLENBURG
BRANDENBURG
HOLSTEIN
R. Eider
Saxony
HAMBURG
Lubec
FRIESLAND
Bremen
Brandenburg
Utrecht
WESTFALIA
Magdeburg
R. Oder
LAUSITZ
SILESIA
Paderborn
SAXONY
Sluys
Bruges
Ghent
FLANDERS
BRABANT
LUXEMBURG
AACHEN
Calais
Cressy
Luttich
Köln
KINGDOM OF
Prag
BOHEMIA
MORAVIA
Rouen
Laon
Trier
Mainz
Frankfurt
R. Rhine
Wurzburg
Nurnberg
Regensburg
BAVARIA
Rheims
LORRAINE
PARIS
Strassburg
Salzburg
AUSTRIA
STYRIA
Renges
Le Mans
BRITTANY
Angers
R. Loire
Bourges
D. OF BURGUNDY
Dijon
BURGUNDY
Basel
Zurich
Lucerne
SWITZERLAND
GERMANY
HUNGARY
R. Danube
Poitiers
Bern
Chur
TYROL
Brixen
CARINTHIA
Geneva
SAVOY
Aosta
Trent
Verona
Goerz
Trieste
Lyons
Turin
MILAN
Pavia
VENICE
Bordeaux
Grenoble
DAUPHINY
R. Rhone
R. Po
SERVIA
Genoa
Bayonne
Avignon
Orange
PROVENCE
Lucca
Florence
Toulouse
Nismes
Pisa
ITALY
NAVARRE
Narbonne
Perpignan
SPAIN
Rousillon
R. Ebro
Barcelona
CORSICA
ROME
NAPLES

of the Hapsburg or Austrian family; the religious movement of the Hussites; and the growing power of the house of Hapsburg.

Embraced within the limits of the mediæval empire was the country now known as Switzerland. Its liberty-loving people yielded to the emperor a nominal obedience, like that of the free imperial cities; but they were very impatient of the claims of various feudal lords to political rights and authority over them.

Among the lords claiming or actually possessing rights over different cantons or communities were the counts of Hapsburg.[82] The efforts of the Hapsburgs to bring the mountaineers wholly under their direct power led the three so-called Forest Cantons, Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden, to form a defensive union, known as the Everlasting Compact (1291). This league laid the basis of the Swiss Confederation, one of the most typical and interesting of the federal states of to-day.

The struggle between the brave hillsmen and the house of Hapsburg was long and memorable. Embellished by Swiss patriotism with thrilling tales of heroic daring and self-devotion, the history of this contest reads like an Iliad. But modern historical criticism has reduced much of the story to prose. Thus the tale of the hero-patriot William Tell and of the tyrant Gessler we now know to be a myth, with nothing but the revolt as the nucleus of fact.

In the early part of the fourteenth century Leopold of Austria engaged in an attempt upon the liberties of the cantons, but at the renowned battle of Morgarten (1315) was defeated by the brave Swiss. The league soon after this was joined by five other cantons, including Lucerne, Zurich, and Berne.

Seventy years later, in 1386, a descendant of Leopold, having marched an army among the mountains, sustained a

[82] So called from the castle of Hapsburg, in Switzerland, the cradle of the house. In 1273 Count Rudolph of Hapsburg was chosen emperor. A little later he acquired Austria as an appanage for his house. From this new possession the family took a new title, — that of the house of Austria.

terrible defeat on the memorable field of Sempach. It was here, as another patriotic myth relates, that Arnold of Winkelried broke the ranks of the Austrians by collecting in his arms as many of their lances as he could, and, as they pierced his breast, bearing them with him to the ground, exclaiming, "Comrades, I will open a road for you." [33]

Just at the close of the Middle Ages (in 1499) the Hapsburg emperor Maximilian, having been defeated in a war with the league, concluded with it a treaty which practically established the independence of the Swiss Confederation, and gave it a place in the family of European states. Yet it was not formally separated from the empire until the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648.

One effect upon the Swiss of their long struggle for liberty was the fostering among them of such a love for the military life that when, at a later period, there was lack of warlike occupation for them at home, the Swiss soldiers hired themselves out to the different sovereigns of Europe; and thus it happened that, though trained in the school of freedom, these sturdy mountaineers became the most noted mercenary supporters of despotism.

371. The Hussites. — About the beginning of the fifteenth century, through the medium of the university connections between England and Germany, the doctrines of the English reformer Wycliffe began to spread in Bohemia. The chief of the new sect was John Huss, a professor of the University of Prague. The doctrines of the reformer were condemned by the great Council of Constance, and Huss himself, having been delivered over into the hands of the civil authorities for punishment, was burned at the stake [34] (1415). The

[33] Shortly after the battle of Sempach, the *Eidgenossen*, or "Confederates," as the Swiss were at this time called, gained another victory over the Austrians at Näfels (1388), which placed on a firm basis the growing power of the league.

[34] The most reprehensible part of this affair was the imprisonment and harsh treatment of Huss *before* his conviction; for this was in direct violation of the safe-conduct which the emperor Sigismund had given him, relying upon which the reformer had come to the council.

following year Jerome of Prague, another reformer, was likewise burned.

Shortly after the burning of Huss a crusade was proclaimed against his followers, who had risen in arms. Then began a cruel, desolating war of fifteen years, the outcome of which was the almost total extermination of the radical party among the Hussites. With the more moderate of the reformers, however, a treaty was made which secured them freedom of worship.

372. The Imperial Crown becomes Hereditary in the House of Austria (1438). — In the year 1438, Albert, duke of Austria, was raised by the Electors to the imperial throne. His accession marks an epoch in German history, for from this time on until the dissolution of the empire by Napoleon in 1806, the imperial crown was practically hereditary in the Hapsburg family, the Electors, although never failing to go through the formality of an election, always choosing a person of Hapsburg descent.[35]

373. The Reign of Maximilian I. — The greatest of the Hapsburg line during the mediæval period was Maximilian I (1493–1519). The most noteworthy matter of his reign was the efforts made for constitutional reforms which should enable Germany to secure that internal peace and national unity which France, England, and Spain had each already in a fair degree attained.

The condition of Germany at this time was somewhat similar to that of our Union under the Articles of Confederation. There was no efficient central executive authority. There was neither a system of imperial taxation nor an imperial army. And lacking these, the emperor's authority was of course merely nominal. Taxes were voted by the Diet, but they were not paid. The raising of armies was authorized by the same body, but the states failed to furnish their respective contingents.

[35] There was one exception: Francis I (of Lorraine), 1747–1765, was chosen as the husband of the Hapsburg queen, Maria Theresa.

The need of a firmer union was recognized. One way of reaching this end was to invest the emperor with greater authority. But the Electors and princes, dominated wholly by selfish and narrow interests, would not give up any part of their privileges and power. "To expect help from the princes," said despairingly a friend of the emperor, "is like looking for grapes from thistles."

In the so-called Diet of Worms (1495) a perpetual national peace was indeed proclaimed, and all the princes and cities were strictly prohibited from waging private wars. Every matter of dispute between the states was to be referred to an Imperial Chamber, the decisions of which were to be upheld by the whole strength of the empire. This tribunal reminds us of the Supreme Court in our own federal system of government. But this reform movement came to naught. Local interests were yet too strong and any true national sentiment too wholly lacking.

Working under such untoward circumstances Maximilian, although he had large and ambitious plans for the empire, accomplished but little. All his undertakings failed on account of lack of resources. On several sides the empire was shorn of territory; within, brigandage was rife. The emperor's pathetic words, "Earth possesses no joy for me; alas, poor land of Germany!" vividly reveal to us the hopeless condition of the "Fatherland" as the Middle Ages were closing.

Beginnings of German Literature

374. The Nibelungen Lied. — It was during the rule of the Hohenstaufen that Germany produced the first pieces of a national literature. The *Nibelungen Lied*, or the "Lay of the Nibelungs," is the great German mediæval epic. It was reduced to writing about 1200, being a recast, by some Homeric genius perhaps, of ancient German legends and lays *dating from* the sixth and seventh centuries. The hero of the

story is Siegfried, the Achilles of Teutonic legend and song. The names and deeds of Attila, Theodoric, and other warriors of the age of the Wanderings of the Nations are mingled in its lines.

This great national epic romance may be likened to the poem *Beowulf* of our Saxon ancestors (par. 35). It is gross and brutal, filled with fierce fightings and horrible slaughters — a reflection of the rude times that gave birth to the original ballads out of which the epic was woven; but there are also embodied in it the feudal virtues of loyalty and courage, while it further bears traces of the later softening influences of Christianity and of chivalry.

375. The Minnesingers. — Under the same emperors, during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Minnesingers, the poets of love, as the word signifies, flourished. They were the "Troubadours of Germany." The most eminent of the Minnesingers was Walter of the Vogelweide (1170–1227), to whom we are indebted for the epigram, "Woman is women's fairest name, and honors them more than Lady." Most of the love-songs of these minstrels were refined and chivalrous and pure, and thus tended to soften the manners and lift the hearts of the German people.

Closely connected with the lyric poetry of the Minnesingers is a species of chivalric romances known as court epics. Some of these pieces have classical subjects, but the finest have for their groundwork the mythic Celtic-French legends of the Holy Grail and of the Knights of King Arthur's Round Table. The best representative of these romances is the poem of *Parzival*, or *Parsifal*.[86] The knight Parzival, the hero of the epic, is the mediæval Faust. The moral and spiritual teaching of the poem is that only through humility, purity, and human sympathy can the soul attain unto the highest perfection of which it is capable.

Just at the close of the Middle Ages, as we noticed in our account of the Renaissance in Italy, the humanistic studies

[86] By Wolfram of Eschenbach (d. about 1220).

came to interest the scholars of Germany. The result was that for three hundred years thereafter much of the best literary work of the German scholars and writers was done in Latin — the mother tongue being regarded, by the younger or later humanists, as plebeian and fit only for inferior composition, and thus the development of the vernacular literature was seriously checked.

V. Russia

376. The Beginnings of Russia. — We have already seen how, about the middle of the ninth century, the Swedish adventurer Rurik became the chief of some Slavonic and Finnish tribes dwelling on the shores of the Gulf of Finland, in the neighborhood of Novgorod, and there laid the foundation of what was destined to grow into one of the leading powers of Europe (par. 115). The state came to be known as Russia, from *Ros*, the name of the Scandinavian settlers.

In the course of a few generations the Norse intruders were thoroughly Slavonized, becoming completely identified in speech, manners, tastes, and sympathies with the people over whom fortune had called them to rule. The descendants of Rurik gradually extended their authority over adjoining tribes, until nearly all the northwestern Slavs were included in their growing dominions.

377. The Mongol Invasion. — Before the end of the eleventh century the unity of the Russian state had become almost completely destroyed. The monarchy became a loose confederacy of petty, jealous, and warring principalities, of which the prince of Kiev was the nominal head and suzerain. This state of things prepared the way for the overwhelming calamity which befell Russia in the thirteenth century.

The misfortune to which we refer was the overrunning and conquest of the country by the Tartar hordes of Jenghiz Khan and his successors.[87] The barbarian conquerors inflicted the

[87] See pars. 242 and 243.

most horrible atrocities upon the unfortunate land, and for two hundred and fifty years held the Russian princes in a degrading bondage, forcing them to pay homage and tribute. This period is almost a perfect blank in Russian history. The misfortune delayed for centuries the nationalization of the Slavonian peoples. It was just such a misfortune as a little later befell the Greeks and the other races of Southeastern Europe.

Russia and the Scandinavian Countries at the Close of the Middle Ages

378. The Rise of Muscovy; Russia freed from the Mongols. — During this period of Tartar domination the state of Muscovy, so called from Moscow, its center and capital, gradually extended its dominions until it became easily the first among all the Slavonic states. In 1470 the prince of Moscow annexed Novgorod the Mighty to his dominions. This new Russian power now felt itself strong enough to throw off the Tartar yoke.

It was under Ivan the Great (1462–1505) that Russia, — now frequently called Muscovy from the fact that it had been

reorganized with Moscow as a center, — after a terrible struggle, succeeded in freeing itself from the hateful Tartar domination and began to assume the character of a well-consolidated monarchy.

Ivan was the first to take the title of "Tzar and Autocrat of all the Russias." He improved the laws, and labored to introduce into his kingdom the civilization of the more advanced European nations. Through his marriage to a niece of Constantine Palæologus, the last Byzantine emperor, Russia was drawn into connection with Greek culture and learning. Moscow, in as true a sense almost as the cities of Italy, became an asylum for those Greek scholars whom the progress of the Ottoman power during the fifteenth century made exiles from their native land.

Thus, by the end of the Middle Ages, Russia had become a really great power; but she was as yet too completely hemmed in by hostile states to be able to make her influence felt in the affairs of Europe. Between her and the Caspian and the Euxine were the Tartars; shutting her out from the Baltic were the Swedes and other peoples; and between her and Germany were the Lithuanians and the Poles.

VI. Italy

379. No National Government. — In marked contrast to all those countries of which we have thus far spoken, unless we except Germany, Italy came to the close of the Middle Ages without a national or regular government. This is to be attributed, as we have already learned, to a variety of causes, but in large part to that unfortunate rivalry between pope and emperor which resulted in dividing Italy into the two hostile camps of Guelph and Ghibelline.

And yet the mediæval period did not pass without attempts on the part of patriot spirits to effect some sort of political *union* among the different cities and states of the peninsula.

The most noteworthy of these movements, and one which gave assurance that the spark of patriotism which was in time to flame into an inextinguishable passion for national unity was kindling in the Italian heart, was that headed by the patriot-hero Rienzi in the fourteenth century.[88]

380. Rienzi, Tribune of Rome (1347). — During the greater part of the fourteenth century the seat of the papal see was at Avignon, beyond the Alps. Throughout this period of the "Babylonish Captivity," Rome, deprived of her natural guardians, was in a state of the greatest confusion. The nobles, prominent among whom were the great baronial families of the Orsini and the Colonnas, terrorized the country about the capitol and kept the streets of the city itself in constant turmoil with their bitter feuds. Every part of the capital was dominated by their fortified residences. The ancient monuments were made to serve as strongholds, and thus these memorials of antiquity suffered greater damage from these mediæval barons than had ever been inflicted upon them by barbarian conquerors.

In the midst of these disorders there appeared from among the lowest ranks of the people a deliverer in the person of one Nicola di Rienzi. With imagination all aflame from long study of the records and monuments of the freedom and the glories of ancient Rome, he conceived the magnificent idea of not only delivering the capital from the wretchedness of the prevailing

[88] Two centuries earlier Arnold of Brescia, a pupil and disciple of the celebrated Abelard, headed a revolution at Rome (1143), which is sometimes spoken of as a movement precursory of that led by Rienzi. This twelfth-century revolution, however, was lacking in the element of national patriotism which characterized the later movement; it was too early in the mediæval time for national sentiment to express itself with any real energy. The aims of Arnold were: (1) to take away from the clergy all property and all temporal power; (2) to make Rome, freed from the temporal authority of the pope, a self-governing community, subject only to the suzerainty of the emperor; and (3) to restore Rome to her old place as the head and center of the empire, and as mistress of the world. The movement failed. Arnold was put to death, his body was burned, and his ashes were thrown into the Tiber (1155), that the people might not collect them as relics.

anarchy, but also of restoring the city to its former proud position as head of Italy and mistress of the world.

Possessed of considerable talent and great eloquence, Rienzi easily incited the people to a revolt against the rule, or rather misrule, of the nobles, and succeeded in having himself, with the title of Tribune, placed at the head of a new government for Rome. In this position his power was virtually absolute. He forced the nobles into submission, and in a short time effected a most wonderful transformation in the city and surrounding country. Order and security took the place of disorder and violence. The best days of republican Rome seemed to have been suddenly restored. The enthusiasm of the Roman populace knew no limits. The remarkable revolution drew the attention of all Italy, and of the world beyond the peninsula as well.

Encouraged by the success that had thus far attended his schemes, Rienzi now began to concert measures for the union of all the principalities and commonwealths of Italy in a great republic, with Rome as its capital. He sent ambassadors throughout Italy to plead, at the courts of the princes and in the council chambers of the municipalities, the cause of Italian unity and freedom.

The splendid dream of Rienzi was shared by other Italian patriots besides himself, among whom was the poet Petrarch, who was the friend and encourager of the plebeian tribune, and who "wished part in the glorious work and in the lofty fame." "Could passion have listened to reason," says Gibbon, "could private welfare have yielded to the public welfare, the supreme tribunal and confederate union of the Italian republic might have healed the intestine discord, and closed the Alps against the barbarians of the North."

But the moment for Italy's unification had not yet come. Not only were there hindrances to the national movement in the ambitions and passions of rival parties and classes, but there were still greater impediments in the character of the

plebeian patriot himself. Rienzi proved to be an unworthy leader. His sudden elevation and surprising success completely turned his head, and he soon began to exhibit the most incredible vanity and weakness. He caused himself to be crowned with seven crowns, emblematic of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, and assumed the title of "Deliverer of Rome; Defender of Italy; Friend of Mankind, and of Liberty, Peace, and Justice; Tribune August."

The natural consequences of the Tribune's extravagant follies were soon reached. The people withdrew from him their support; the pope excommunicated him as a rebel and heretic; and the nobles rose against him. Abdicating his office, Rienzi now went into exile. After an absence from the city of six years, he was sent back by the pope (he had become reconciled with the Church) as his minister, with the title of Senator; but after a rule of a few months he was killed in a sudden uprising of the people (1354).

Thus vanished the dream of Rienzi and of Petrarch, of the hero and of the poet. Centuries of division, of shameful subjection to foreign princes, — French, Spanish, and Austrian, — of wars and suffering, were yet before the Italian people ere Rome should become the center of a free, orderly, and united Italy.

381. The Five Great States. — The unification of Italy was impossible; yet the later mediæval time witnessed a movement in the direction of the consolidation of the numerous petty states of the northern and central regions into larger ones. By the middle of the fifteenth century the greater part of the peninsula was divided between five so-called Great States, — the duchy of Milan [89] and the two nominal republics of Venice and Florence in the North, the States of the Church in Central Italy, and the old kingdom of Naples in the South.

[89] Milan was in the hands of the powerful family of the Visconti. The last of the house died in 1447, and was succeeded in 1450 by Francesco Sforza, the founder of the celebrated family of Sforza.

The formation of these states and the establishment of a sort of balance of power between them hushed the savage quarrels of the individual cities and gave Italy finally a few years of comparative peace (1447–1492).

But these great states, like the smaller ones, were jealous of one another. It was their inability to act in concert that enabled the French king, Charles VIII, to march in such an extraordinary way from one end of the peninsula to the other (par. 347). Thus was Italy again opened to the "barbarians" of the North. It was the beginning, as we have seen, of the foreign enslavement of the peninsula. For three centuries and more Italy was destined to be merely "a geographical expression."

382. The Renaissance. — Though the Middle Ages closed in Italy without the rise there of a national government, still before the end of the period much had been done to create those common ideals and sentiments upon which political unity can alone securely repose.

Literature and art here performed the part that war did in other countries in arousing a national pride and spirit. The Renaissance, with its revelations and achievements, revealing the Italians to themselves, did much towards creating among them a common pride in race and country; and thus this splendid literary and artistic enthusiasm was the first step in a course of national development which was to lead the Italian people, in the fullness of time, to a common political life.

Here, in connection with Italian Renaissance literature, a word will be in place respecting *The Prince* by Machiavelli. In this remarkable book the writer, imbued with a deep patriotic sentiment, points out the way in which, in the midst of the existing chaos, material and spiritual, Italy might be consolidated into a great state, like England or France or Spain.

The redeemer of Italy and the maker of the new state must be a strong despotic prince, — the author had the Medici of

Florence in mind, — who in the work must have no moral scruples whatever, but be ready to use all means, however cruel and unjust and wicked, which promised to further the end in view. After the prince had created a united Italy, then he must rule in righteousness as the representative of the people.

The way in which Machiavelli instructs the prince to build up a state out of the broken-down institutions of the Middle Ages was, in truth, the very way in which the despots of his time in Italy had actually created their principalities; but that he should have seriously advised any one to adopt their immoral statecraft soon raised against him and his teachings, especially in the North, a storm of protest and denunciation which has not yet subsided. Machiavelli found disciples enough, however, so that his work had a vast though sinister influence in moulding the political morality of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Villari says, though certainly with exaggeration, "It is beyond doubt that the 'Prince' had a more direct active force upon real life than any other book in the world, and a larger share in emancipating Europe from the Middle Ages."

383. **Savonarola** (1452–1498). — A word must here be said respecting the Florentine monk and reformer Girolamo Savonarola, who stands as the most noteworthy personage in Italy during the closing years of the mediæval period.

Savonarola was at once Hebrew prophet and Roman censor. Such a preacher of righteousness the world had not seen since the days of Elijah. He denounced the Medici as the enslavers and corrupters of Florence; thundered against the iniquities of the infamous Borgias at Rome; fought to counteract the pagan tendencies of the Renaissance; hurled denunciations against the profligacy of the monks; and prophesied the wrath of God on Florence, Italy, and all the world, on account of the degeneracy of the Church and the paganism and wickedness of the times.

His powerful preaching alarmed the conscience of the Florentines. At his suggestion the women brought their finery and ornaments, and others their beautiful works of art, and, piling them in great heaps in the streets of Florence, burned them as vanities. Savonarola even urged that the government of Florence be made a theocracy, and Christ be proclaimed king. But, finally, the activity of his enemies brought about the reformer's downfall, and he was condemned to death, strangled, his body burned, and his ashes thrown into the Arno.

Savonarola may be regarded as the last great mediæval forerunner of the reformers of the sixteenth century. Yet he must not be thought of as a reformer in the same sense that Luther, for instance, was. He was not a precursor of Protestantism. He stood firmly on Catholic ground. He believed the papacy to be a divine institution. His reform was a reaction against the pagan and immoral tendencies of the Renaissance. He waged warfare against the humanists and their heathen studies; he declared that in matters of faith an old woman was wiser than Plato. In like manner he opposed the artistic revival, which to him, Puritan as he was, seemed a dangerous renewal of what was most unblushingly immoral and debasing in the pagan past.

VII. The Northern Countries

384. The Union of Calmar (1397). — The great Scandinavian Exodus of the ninth and tenth centuries drained the Northern lands of some of the best elements of their population. For this reason these countries did not play as prominent a part in mediæval history as they probably would otherwise have done. The constant contentions between their sovereigns and the nobility were also another cause of internal weakness.

In the year 1397, by what is known as the Union of Calmar, *the three* kingdoms of Norway, Denmark, and Sweden were

united under Margaret of Denmark, "the Semiramis of the North." The treaty provided that each country should retain its constitution and make its own laws. But the treaty was violated, and though the friends of the measure had hoped much from it, it brought only jealousies, feuds, and wars.

Thus the history of these Northern countries during the later mediæval time presents nothing of primary interest which calls for narration here; but early in the Modern Age we shall see Sweden developing rapidly as an independent monarchy and for a period playing an important part in European affairs.

Sources and Source Material. — JOHN FROISSART, *Chronicles of England, France, Spain, and the Adjoining Countries.* There are two standard English translations of this well-known work, one by Lord Berners and another by Thomas Johnes. The one by Johnes is recommended; the sixteenth-century English of Lord Berners's translation presents some difficulties to the ordinary student. For a word respecting Froissart, see par. 351. Monstrelet's *Chronicles*, also available in an English translation by Johnes, form a continuation of Froissart's work, bringing the narrative of events, by different hands, down to the year 1516. Commines's *Memoirs* (Bohn) cover the years from 1464 to 1498. Henderson's *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, pp. 1–168. *Old South Leaflets*, No. 5, "Magna Charta." Kendall's *Source-Book of English History:* extracts comprising chap. v, "The Struggle for Constitutional Liberty"; chap. vi, "The Hundred Years' War"; and chap. vii, "The Wars of the Roses." Gee and Hardy's *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, and Adams and Stephens's *Select Documents of English Constitutional History.* These volumes contain a great variety of valuable source material bearing on the particular phases of English history with which they respectively deal. Lee's *Source-Book of English History*, chaps. viii–xiii. Colby's *Selections from the Sources of English History*, Extracts 22–52. In the "English History by Contemporary Writers" series will be found the following convenient little volumes, ed. by W. H. Hutton: *S. Thomas of Canterbury; The Misrule of Henry III; Simon de Montfort and his Cause; Edward III and his Wars.* These volumes are made up of extracts from chronicles, state papers, memoirs, letters, and other contemporary writings. *Translations and Reprints* (Univ. of Penn.), vol. ii,

No. 5, "England in the Time of Wycliffe." E. Powell and G. M. Trevelyan's *Documents illustrating the Peasants' Rising and the Lollards.* In the study of social England in the fourteenth century the student should not overlook Langland's *Vision of Piers Plowman* or the "Prologue" to Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* (see pars. 334 and 335). For English history in the fifteenth century, Hall's *Chronicle* and *The Paston Letters* furnish abundant material.

Secondary or Modern Works. — (1) Works of a general character. FREEMAN (E. A.), *Historical Geography of Europe*, 2 vols. (vol. ii consists of maps). Very useful in tracing the shifting boundaries of the growing states. GUIZOT (F. P. G.), *History of Civilization in Europe*, lects. ix and xi; and *History of Civilization in France*, the "second course" of lectures. WILSON (W.), *The State.* Has valuable chapters on the development of the governmental institutions of the leading states. JENKS (E.), *Law and Politics in the Middle Ages.* This work furnishes another standpoint than that of the empire and the papacy from which to study mediæval history. "The struggle between the State and the Clan," the author maintains, "is really the key to the internal politics of the Middle Ages." Law students will find the work very suggestive. DUNNING (W. A.), *A History of Political Theories*, chaps. x and xi. LODGE (R.), *The Close of the Middle Ages, 1273–1494* (Periods of European History). ADAMS (G. B.), *The Growth of the French Nation*, chaps. vi–x; and *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, chap. xiii, "The Formation of France," and chap. xiv, "England and the Other States."

(2) National histories. The "Story of the Nations" series contains convenient volumes on each of the chief European states. GREEN (J. R.), *History of the English People*, parts of vols. i and ii. LINGARD (J.), *History of England* (5th ed.), earlier volumes. The standard history from the Catholic side. KITCHIN (G. W.), *History of France*, vol. i. HENDERSON (E. F.), ***History of Germany in the Middle Ages.* The best single-volume history on mediæval Germany; also the same author's ***A Short History of Germany*, vol. i. In "The Great Peoples Series," HASSALL (A.), *The French People*, chaps. iv–ix; and HUME (M. A. S.), ***The Spanish People.* BURKE (U. R.), *A History of Spain from the Earliest Times to the Death of Ferdinand the Catholic* (2d ed., 1900), 2 vols. Gardiner's, Coman and Kendall's, Montgomery's, and Terry's histories of England, and Duruy's *History of France* (with a continuation by J. Franklin Jameson) are excellent single-volume text-books.

(3) Biographies and books for the further study of special topics. In the "Epochs of Modern History" and the "Heroes of the Nations"

series are to be found separate volumes covering many of the matters, political and biographical, touched upon in the present chapter. MILMAN (H. H.), *History of Latin Christianity*, vol. iv, bk. viii, chap. viii, gives an excellent account of the struggle between Henry II and Thomas of Canterbury. FREEMAN (E. A.), *Historical Essays* (First Series), for a review entitled "Saint Thomas of Canterbury and his Biographers." In the "Twelve English Statesmen" series, GREEN (MRS. J. R.), **Henry the Second*, and TOUT (F. F.), *Edward the First*; in the "Foreign Statesmen" series, HUTTON (W. H.), *Philip Augustus*. LOWELL (F C.), **Joan of Arc*. TREVELYAN (G. M.), ***England in the Age of Wycliffe* (3d ed.). Furnishes the best account we possess of the Peasants' Revolt. POOLE (R. L.), *Wycliffe and Movements for Reform* (Epochs of Church History). GASQUET (F. A.), ***The Great Pestilence*. JESSOPP (A.), *The Coming of the Friars and Other Historic Essays*, chaps. iv and v, "The Black Death in East Anglia." CHEYNEY (E. P.), *An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England*, chap. v, ** "The Black Death and the Peasants' Rebellion." For English constitutional matters the student should consult Stubbs's, Taswell-Langmead's, Macy's, and Taylor's works. TRAILL (H. D.), *Social England*, vol. ii. SMITH (J. H.), *The Troubadours at Home*, 2 vols. The best work in our language on the subject with which it deals. JANSSEN (J.), *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages* (trans. from the German), 4 vols. VILLARI (P.), ***Life and Times of Girolamo Savonarola* (trans. by Linda Villari), 2 vols. MRS. OLIPHANT, *The Makers of Florence*. LEA (H. C.), *A History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. KIRK (J. F.), *History of Charles the Bold*, 3 vols. A notable work. PRESCOTT (W. H.), *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*. IRVING (W.), *The Conquest of Granada*. There are many editions of this work.

For the history of the pre-Wycliffite translations of parts of the Bible into the vernacular of the English people, the student should turn to KENYON (F. G.), *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (3d ed., London, 1898). In regard to the use in Wycliffe's time of the Anglo-Saxon translation of the Gospels, Kenyon has this to say: "The old Anglo-Saxon version of the Gospels had dropped out of use, as its language gradually became antiquated and unintelligible; and no new translation had taken its place. The Psalms alone were extant in versions which made any pretence to be faithful. The remaining books of the Bible were known to the common people only in the shape of rhyming paraphrases, or by such oral teaching as the clergy may have given" (p. 197).

Respecting the contention that there were English translations of the entire Bible before Wycliffe's time, the same authority observes:

"Nor is there any sufficient reason for the opinion, which has been sometimes held, that a complete English Bible existed before his time. It rests mainly on the statement of Sir Thomas More, in his controversy with Tyndale, the author of the first printed English New Testament, that he had seen English Bibles of an earlier date than Wycliffe's. No trace of such a Bible exists, and it is highly probable that More was not aware that there were two Wycliffite translations, and had mistaken the date of the earlier one" (p. 198).

Quite recently an eminent Catholic scholar, Father Gasquet, has given a wholly new phase to the controversy by challenging the correctness of the hitherto universally held opinion that the Bible known as the Wycliffite translation is the work of the reformer and his adherents. See his *The Old English Bible and Other Essays* (London, 1897). Father Gasquet maintains that if Wycliffe, with the aid of other scholars, ever made a translation of the Bible, all copies of it were destroyed, and that the translation ascribed to him and his followers is really a Catholic version authorized by the pre-Reformation bishops of the Church in England. It should be added that Father Gasquet's conclusions have not generally gained the acceptance of other scholars.

INDEX AND PRONOUNCING VOCA

NOTE. — In the case of words whose correct pronunc seemed to be clearly indicated by their accentuation an the sounds of the letters have been denoted thus: ā, lik like ā, only less prolonged; ă, like *a* in *hăve;* ä, like *a* in in *ạll;* ē, like *ee* in *meet;* ḗ, like ē, only less prolonged; ȇ ê, like *e* in *thêre;* ĕ, like *e* in *ĕrr;* ī, like *i* in *pīne;* ĭ, li like *o* in *nōte;* ṓ, like ō, only less prolonged; ŏ, like *o* in in *ôrb;* o͞o, like *oo* in *mo͞on;* ū, like *u* in *ūse;* ŭ, like c and ch, like *k;* ç, like *s;* g̃, like *g* in *g̃et;* ġ, like *j;* ş in German *ạch;* ɢ, small capital, as in German *Hamburg minion;* ṅ denotes the nasal sound in French, being simila

Aachen (ä′ken), 128.
Abbassides (ab-băs′ĭdz), dynasty of the, 106.
Abdallah (äbd-äl′äh), caliph, 107.
Äbd′er-räh″män, Saracen leader at Tours, 106; emir of Cordova, 108; III, caliph, 108, n. 12.
Ab′e-lärd, Peter, 314–316.
Abu Bekr (ä′bo͞o bek′r), first caliph, 95–97.
Academies, in the Renaissance, 343.
Acre (ä′ker), siege of, by crusaders, 237; captured by Mamelukes, 244.
Ä-frä-sĭ-äb′, Persian legendary hero, 280, n. 8.
Africa, North, recovery of, by Justinian, 73–75; conquest of, by the Arabs, 102–104.
Agincourt (ä′zhăn-ko͞or″), battle of, 381.
Ä′grä, 274.
Aids, feudal, 170.
Aistulf (īs′tulf), kin
bards, 119.
Äk′bar, Arab leade
Albert, duke of Au
Albert the Great, S
Alberti (äl-bêr′tē), architect, 348, n.
Ăl′bĭ-ġĕn″sēş, crus 247, 248; pre-Ren ment among, 328.
Al′boin, king of Lo
Alcuin (ăl′kwin), 12
Ăl′dĭne (or ạl′dīn),
Aldine Press, at Ve
Ăl′dus Ma-nū′tĭ-us,
Alexander of Hale 317, n. 11.
Alexandria, capture cens, 100.
Alexandrian Librar

Alexius An'ge-lus, Greek prince, 240.
Alexius Com-nē'nus I, Greek emperor, asks aid of the Latins against the Turks, 225.
Alfred the Great, king of England, 139–142.
Ali (ä'lē), caliph, 101, 102.
Almansur (äl-män-sōōr'), caliph, 107.
Alphonso, king of Castile, emperor-elect H. R. E., 417.
Amalfi (ä-mäl'fē), 191.
America, discovered by Northmen, 136.
Amru (äm'rōō), Arab chieftain, 99, 100.
Amurath (ä-mōō-rät') I, Turkish sultan, 278.
Anagni (ä-nän'yē), 264.
Anchorites. See *Hermits.*
Anglo-Saxons, conquest of Britain, 26–29. See *England.*
An-gō'ra, battle of, 279.
Anne of Brittany, 399.
Antioch, destroyed by earthquake, 81; taken by crusaders, 229.
Aqueducts, Roman, destroyed in Gothic wars, 76.
A-quī'nas, Thomas, 317.
Arabian Nights, 112.
Arabic system of notation, 113.
Arabs, origin and character, 87; religious condition before Mohammed, 87; spread of their religion and language, 109. See *Saracens* and *Moors.*
Aragon, union with Castile, 405.
Archæology, science of, created by classical revival, 357.
Architecture, mediæval, 348, n. 16.
Arian creed, 34.
Aristotle, quoted, 303, n. 11.
Arnold of Brescia, 427, n. 38.
Arthur, King, 28.
As'ca-lon, battle of, 233.
Assisi (ä-sē'sē), 260.
Assizes of Jerusalem, 232.
Äs-tu'rĭ-äs, the, 405.
Athens, schools of, closed by Justinian, 79; dukedom of, 240.
Au'gus-tīne, his mission to Britain, 36.
Aus-trā'sia, division of Frankish monarchy, 23.
Austria, house of, 419, n. 32; 421.
Auto de fe (ą'tō-dā-fā''), the, 409.
Ä'värs, mentioned, 82; subdued by Charles the Great, 122, 123.
Averroës (a-ver'ō-ez), 317, n. 10.
Avicenna (av-ĭ-sen'a), 317, n. 10.
Avignon (ä'vēn'yōn''), removal of papal seat to, 265.
Ā'von, river, 390.

Bä'bär, founder of Mongol state in India, 274.
Bacon, Roger, 319.
Baduila. See *Totila.*
Bagdad, founded, 107.
Bäj-a-zĕt' or Baj'a-zet I, 278, 279.
Baldwin I, head of Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, 234; II, 234.
Baldwin of Flanders, Latin emperor of the East, 240.
Balkh, 326.
Ball, John, 381.
Balliol (bäl'ĭ-ol), John, Scottish king, 374.
Ban'nock-burn'', battle of, 375.
Bär'net, battle of, 385.
Bartholomew, ordeal of, 229.
Bä'ṣel, Church Council of, 268.
Batu (bä'tōō''), Mongol leader, 272.

Bayezid (bä′yĕ-zēd″). See *Bajazet.*
Baziers (bȧ́′zē-ȧ́″), town, 248.
Bec (bĕk), monastery of, 314.
Becket. See *Thomas Becket.*
Bedawin (bĕd′a-wēn), the, 87.
Bede (bēd), the Venerable, 43, n. 10.
Bedr (bĕd′r), battle of, 92.
Begging friars. See *Mendicant friars.*
Bel-ĭ-sā′rĭ-us, general, conquers the Vandals, 21; in Italy, 73–78.
Benares (be-nä′rez), 215.
Benedictines, order of the, 54; as agriculturists, 55.
Ben′e-fic″ĭ-um, the, 166.
Beowulf (bā′ō-wulf), Saxon poem, 42.
Bĕr′gĕn, 290.
Bertha, Frankish princess, 37.
Bertrand (ber-trŏn′) de Born, minstrel, 402.
Be-ry′tus, destroyed by earthquake, 81.
Biel (bēl), Gabriel, 320, n. 16.
Black Death, the, 378; effect on wages in England, 380.
Black Prince, the, 379.
Blues and Greens, factions at Constantinople, 80.
Boccaccio (bok-ḳät′chō), his *Decameron*, 339; as a humanist, 339.
Bō-ē′thĭ-us, 18.
Bō′hē-mond, prince of Otranto, 228.
Bō-nä-vĕn-tu′rä, 317, n. 12.
Bosworth Field, battle of, 385.
Brä-män′te, architect, 348, n. 16.
Bretigny (bre-tēn-yĭ′), Treaty of, 379.
Britain, Anglo-Saxon conquest of, 26–29. See *England.*
Brittany, origin of name, 28, n. 6; asylum of Britons, 28, n. 6.
Bruce, Robert, king of Scotland, 375.
Brū′ġeş (Fr. pron. brüzh), 290.
Brunelleschi (brōō-nĕl-lĕs′kē), among the ruins of Rome, 338, n. 10; designer of the dome of the cathedral at Florence, 348, n. 16; imparts a new spirit to architecture, 349, n. 19.
Bulgarians, their conversion, 35.
Burgundians, kingdom of the, 19; their conversion, 35.
Bur′gun-dy, origin of name, 20; kingdom of, joined to the H. R. E., 413.
Byzantine empire. See *Eastern Empire.*

Cadijah (kä-dē′jä), 89.
Cæd′mon, his *Paraphrase*, 43.
Cairo, founded, 108.
Calais (kăl′iss), captured by English, 378.
Caliphate of Bagdad, established, 107; Golden Age of, 107; dismemberment of, 107, 108.
Caliphate of Cordova, 108, n. 12.
Calmar, Union of, 432, 433.
Cam-ba-lu′, Mongol capital, 273.
Cä-nŏs′sä, Henry IV's humiliation at, 209.
Can-tā′bri-a, 405.
Canterbury, becomes seat of cathedral, 37.
Ca-nūte′, king of England, 144–146.
Cā′pet, Hugh, king of France, 391.
Capetians. See *France.*
Capitularies of Charles the Great, 126.

Cardinals, Sacred College of, 205, n. 5.
Carloman, king of Franks, 120, 121.
Cär-när'von, castle of, 372, 373.
Car-o-lin'gi-an family, beginning of, 119; its extinction, 130.
Carolingian revival of the ninth century, 326.
Carolingians, Franks under, 117–131.
Carroccio (cär-rŏt'chō), 294, n. 3.
Carthage, becomes Vandal capital, 20; destroyed by Arabs, 103.
Carthusians, 55.
Cas'sĭ-o-dō''rus, Theodoric's minister, 18; introduces intellectual labor into the cloister, 56, n. 7.
Castile (kas-tēl'), the name, 405; union with Aragon, 405.
Castles, feudal, 175.
Cathedral building, 415.
Caxton, William, 390.
Celibacy of the clergy, 206.
Celtic Church, 38–40.
Celts, at opening of the Middle Ages, 12; Christianity among, 38–40; conversion of Irish Celts by St. Patrick, 38.
Cerdagne (sĕr'dāñ''), 398.
Cēr-văn'tĕs, 186.
Ceuta (sū'tä), 105, n. 11.
Charlemagne (shär'le-mān). See *Charles the Great.*
Charles IV, king of France, 377; V, 381; VII, 382; VIII, 399, 400.
Charles the Bald, king of the Western Franks, 160.
Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy, 398.
Charles IV, emperor H. R. E., 417, n. 31.
Charles the Great, king of Franks, 120–129; his wars, 120–123; restores the empire in the West, 123–125; as a ruler, 125–128; his palace school, 127; his death, 128; results of his reign, 129; division of his dominions, 130.
Charles Martel, at battle of Tours, 24; dies without royal title, 108; creates a cavalry force, 181.
Charles the Simple, king of the Western Franks, 147.
Chaucer, Geoffrey, 387; his *Canterbury Tales*, 387, 388.
Chil'de-ric, last Merovingian king, 119.
Children's Crusade, the, 241–243.
Chivalry, origin of, 181; its universality, 182; training of the knight, 182; ceremony of knighting, 183; the tournament, 183; character of the knight, 184; decline of the system, 185; evil and good in system, 186.
Chlodwig. See *Clovis.*
Chos'ro-eş II, king of Persia, 82, 83, 84.
Christianity, as factor in mediæval history, 7; introduced among the Teutonic tribes, 32–48; progress of, before the fall of Rome, 33; introduced into Russia, 45; reacted upon by paganism, 47.
Chronicle, Anglo-Saxon, 145, n. 5.
Chrys-ō-lō'ras, Manuel, Greek scholar, 340 and n. 12.
Church, early constitution of, 150; separation of the Eastern from the Western or Latin Church, 157, n. 4; growth of a martial spirit in, 218.

Church Councils: Council of Nicæa, 34; of Pisa, 266; of Constance, 267, 268; of Basel, 268; of Trent, 268.
Cid, poem of the, 410.
Cimabue (chē-mä-boo'ā), 350, n. 21.
Cistercians, 55.
Clarendon, Constitutions of, 365, 366.
Clotilda, Queen, 35.
Clo'vis, king of the Franks, 22, 23; his conversion, 34.
Cluniac revival, 216, 220, 222.
Cluny (klü-nē'), monastery of, 55, 220.
Codes, of the Teutons, 65; Justinian code, 79; Assizes of Jerusalem, 232.
Colonnas, family of the, 427.
Columbus, Christopher, 409.
Comitatus, the, 167.
Commendation, Gallic custom, 167.
Commines (ko-mēn'), Philippe de, 404, n. 27.
Commons, English House of, origin, 370, 371. See *Parliament, English*.
Condottieri (kŏn'dŏt-tyā''rē), 297.
Conrad III, emperor H. R. E., 236.
Cŏn'rä-dĭn (or kŏn'rä-dēn), 414, n. 30.
Constance, Church Council of, 267; peace of, 295.
Con'stan-tīne VI, Eastern emperor, 123.
Constantine, the African, 309, n. 4.
Constantine Palæologus, last emperor of the East, 279, 426.
Constantinople, besieged by Persians, 84; by Saracens, 104; captured by Crusaders, 239–241; by Ottoman Turks, 279.
Conway, castle, 372.
Coptic Christians, 100.
Cor'pus Ju'ris Ci-vi'lis, 79.
Correggio (kor-rĕd'jō), 351, n. 25.
Cortes (kôr'tĕs), Spanish, 304, n. 14.
Coster of Haarlem, 345, n. 15.
Council of Ten at Venice, 298.
Crécy (krĕs'se), battle of, 377.
Crusades, enumerated, 214; causes of, 215–222; circumstances favoring, 223; legend of Peter the Hermit, 224; Councils of Piacenza and Clermont, 225; narrative of the Crusades in the East, 227–245; Crusades in Europe, 245–248; why Crusades ceased, 248; their results for European civilization, 249–255; their relation to the Renaissance, 326. See Table of Contents.
Curfew, the, 197.

Dăg'o-bĕrt I, 23, n. 3.
Da-mas'cĭ-us, Greek philosopher, 80.
Damascus, captured by Saracens, 97.
Dän'dō-lō, Henry, doge, 240.
Danelagh (dān'lạ), the, 134.
Danes, their ravages in England, 139; their conquest of the island, 142–145; reign of Canute, 145; results to England of Danish conquest, 146. See *Scandinavians*.
Dante, Alighieri (ä-lē-ḡe-ā'rē), precursor of the Renaissance, 330; his *Commedia*, 330, 331.
Dark Ages, the, character of, 2.
Dauphin, origin of title, 397, n. 21.
Dauphiné (dō-fē-nā'), province, 397.

Delhi (del'lē), 274.
Denmark. See *Calmar, Union of.*
De-ōr'häm, battle of, 28, n. 5.
Des-ī-de'rĭ-us, king of the Lombards, deposed by Charles the Great, 121.
Despots, Italian, 296.
Dietrich von Bern (dē'trĭch fon bern), 10. See *Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths.*
Di-ŏg'e-nēş, Greek philosopher, 80.
Divina Commēdia (dē-vē'nä kom-mā'dē-ä), 330.
Domesday Book (dōōmz''dā'), 196.
Dominicans, order of the, 260–262.
Dŏn-ä-tĕl'lō, among the ruins of Rome, 338, n. 10; mentioned, 350, n. 20.
Donation of Constantine, 158; its unhistorical character shown by Valla, 358.
Dorylæum (dor-ĭ-lē'um), 229.
Duns Scotus, 318.

Eastern empire, sketch of history, 73–86; at the accession of Heraclius, 82; becomes Greek, 85; services of, to European civilization, 85; effects upon, of Crusades, 250.
Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, 159, 160.
Edda, the, 137.
E-des'sa, 235.
Edmund Ironsides, 144, 145.
Education, reformed by the New Learning, 355.
Edward, the Confessor, king of England, 146; his death, 192; I, 372–375; II, 375; III, 376, 377, 378, 379.
Edwin, king of Northumbrians, 37, 38.
Eg'bert, king of Wessex, 29 and notes 7 and 8.
Egypt, conquest of, by Saracens, 99–101.
Einhard (īn'härd), secretary of Charles the Great, 124, n. 5.
Electors, the Seven, of Germany, 416, 417, n. 31.
England, origin of name, 29; Anglo-Saxon conquest of, 26–29; Christianity in, 36–44; results of conversion of Anglo-Saxons, 41, 43; reign of Alfred the Great, 139–142; Danish conquest and rule, 142–146; Saxon line restored, 146; Norman conquest and rule, 191–200; under the houses of Plantagenet, Lancaster, and York, 363–391; loss of possessions in France, 366; conquest of Wales, 372; wars with Scotland, 373–376; Hundred Years' War, 376–384; Wars of the Roses, 384–386. See *Anglo-Saxons* and *Normans.*
English literature, effects upon, of Norman conquest, 387.
E-raş'mus, 343, 359.
E-rĭg'e-nä, John Scotus, 314.
Er'men-rĭch, 10.
Ertogrul (er'tō-grōōl), Ottoman chieftain, 277.
Eschenbach (esh'en-bäch), Wolfram of, 423, n. 36.
Estates-General. See *States-General.*
Ethelbert, king of Kent, 37.
Ethelred II, the Redeless, 143, 144.
Ethelwulf, king of Wessex, 139.
Eu-lā'lĭ-us, Greek philosopher, 80.

Eu'ric, king of the Visigoths, 19.
Excommunication, effects of, 209.

Fa-bi'o-la, 57, n. 8.
False Decretals, the, 159.
Fatima (fä'tē-mä), 101.
Fat'ī-mītes, the, 108.
Faust, printer, 345.
Faustus, legend of, 353, n. 27.
Ferdinand of Aragon, marriage to Isabella of Castile, 405; enhances authority of the crown, 408; sets up the Inquisition, 408, 409; his death, 410.
Feudalism, defined, 162; subinfeudation, 163; Roman and Teutonic elements in, 165; origin of fiefs, 165; origin of feudal patronage, 167; origin of feudal sovereignty, 168; ceremony of homage, 169; relation of lord and vassal, — reliefs, fines, aids, etc., 169, 170; manorial serfs, 170–173; development of the feudal system, 173–175; castles of the nobles, 175; sports of the nobles, 176; causes of decay, 176–178; extinction of, in different countries, 178, n. 10; defects of the system, 178; good results of the system, 179, 180; effects upon, of Crusades, 253, 254.
Fine arts, revival of the, 348–352.
Firdusi (fir-dōō'sē), Persian poet, 280.
Fire-worshipers, 110, n. 15.
Flag'el-lants, 379, n. 12.
Flavio Biondo (flä've-o bē-ŏn'do), 357.
Florence, sketch of history, 301, 302; center of Renaissance movement, 333.
Forest Cantons, the, 419.
Forest laws of the Normans, 197.
Fra An-gel'ī-co, 351, n. 25.
France, beginnings of French kingdom, 391; the Capetian period, 391–400; table of Capetian kings (direct line), 391, n. 18; in the Crusades, 393; effects upon, of the Hundred Years' War, 397. See *Franks*.
Franciscans, order of the, 260–262.
Frankfort, Church Council at, in 742, 155.
Franks, the, under the Merovingians, 21–24; Ripuarian Franks, 21; Salian Franks, 21, 22; their conversion, 34; importance of conversion, 35.
Frederick I, Barbarossa, emperor H. R. E., in Third Crusade, 236, 237; quarrel with Pope Alexander III, 258; his struggle with the Lombard League, 293–295; grants privileges to professors and students, 309, n. 2; represents German nationality, 414; II, relations to the papacy, 262; patron of scholars and poets, 328.
Free Imperial Cities, 417, 418.
Froissart (frwä-sär'), 404.

Gas'cons, the, 121.
Geiseric, king of the Vandals, 20, 33, 75.
Gel'ī-mer, king of the Vandals, 74.
Gen'o-a, 300.
Gep'ī-dæ, mentioned, 17.
German tribes. See *Teutons*.
Germany, conversion of German tribes, 44; beginnings of the kingdom of, 411; renewal of the

empire by Otto the Great, 412; relation of the kingdom to the H. R. E., 413; under the Hohenstaufen, 413–415; the Electors, 416; the Interregnum, 416, 417; the Free Imperial Cities, 418; under the Hapsburgs, 421.
Ghibellines (gĭb′el-linz), 295, n. 5.
Ghiberti (gē-bĕr′tē), sculptor, 350, n. 20.
Gibbon, the historian, mentioned, 11.
Gilds, the, 287–289.
Giotto (jŏt′to), 351, n. 25.
Glendower (glen′dōōr), Owen, 372, n. 8.
Gnostics (nŏs′tiks), 51.
Godfrey of Bouillon (god′frĭ bōō-yŏn′), 228; made head of Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, 232.
Golden Bull, the, 417, n. 31.
Goths. See *Ostrogoths* and *Visigoths*.
Græco-Roman civilization, its elements, 5–7.
Granada, conquest of, 406.
Grand Lä′ma of Thibet, 275.
Great Moguls, the, 274.
Greek empire. See *Eastern empire*.
Greek fire, 105.
Greenland, discovered by the Northmen, 136.
Guadalquivir (gŭä-däl-kĕ-vēr′), river, 108.
Guebers (gē′bers). See *Fire-worshipers*.
Guelphs (gwĕlfs), 295, n. 5.
Guicciardini (gwē-chär-dē′nē), Francesco, 358 and n. 31.
Guiscard (gēs-kär′), Robert, 190, 211.
Gunpowder, effects of use in war, 177.
Gutenberg (gōō′ten-bĕrG), John, 345.
Guthrum (gōōth′rōōm), Danish leader, 140.

Hamburg, 289.
Hanseatic League, 289–291.
Hapsburg, house of. See *Austria, house of*.
Harold, king of England, 192, 193, 194.
Harold *Hairfair*, king of Norway, 136; *Hardrada*, 193.
Harth′a-ca-nūte″, Danish king of England, 146.
Harun-al-Raschid (hä-rōōn′äl-răsh″id), caliph, 107.
Hassan (hä′sen), 102.
Hāst′ing, viking, 140.
Hastings, battle of, 193.
Hegira (hĕ-jī′rä or hĕj′i-rä), the, 90.
Héloïse (ā-lō-ēz′), pupil of Abelard, 316.
Hen′gist, Jutish chief, 27.
Henry of Burgundy, 245.
Henry I, king of England, 199; II, 363–366; III, 370; V, 381; VII, 385.
Henry III, emperor H. R. E., 205; IV, 209–211; VI, 239, n. 7, 414.
Henry, Prince, the Navigator, 410, n. 28.
Hep′tar-chy, Saxon, 29.
Her′a-clī″us, Eastern emperor, reign, 82–85; removes "True Cross" from Jerusalem, 97; his death, 101.
Heresy, in England, punished by burning, 390.

Her-mī'as, Greek philŏsopher, 80.
Hermits, 42, 52, 53.
Hil'de-brand. See *Gregory VII.*
Hip-poc'ra-tēş, 312.
Hira (hĭ-rä'), Mount, 89.
Hohenstaufen (hō''en-stow'fen), house of, Germany under, 413–415.
Holy Lance, the, 229.
Holy Office. See *Inquisition.*
Holy Roman Empire, name attaches to Western empire, 132; relations of, to the papacy, 202–204; under Henry III, 205; under Henry IV, 209–211; Concordat of Worms, 211; created by Otto the Great, 412; relation of, to the German kingdom, 413; results for Germany of the renewal of the imperial authority, 415.
Holy Wars. See *Crusades.*
Homage, ceremony of, 169.
Horsa, Jutish chief, 27.
Ho-sain', 102.
Hos'pi-tal-ers, order of the, origin of, 234; incidents in history, 244; receives landed estates of the Templars, 396.
Hugh of Vermandois (ver-mon-dwä'), 228.
Hulagu (hōō-lä-gōō'), Mongol leader, 273.
Humanism, defined, 335; Petrarch, first of the humanists, 335–339; Boccaccio, as a humanist, 339; Chrysoloras, Greek teacher, 340; search for ancient manuscripts, 340, 341; patrons of the New Learning, 341; fall of Constantinople gives impulse to, 342; translation and criticism of the classics, of academies, 34 printing in re revival, 344-346 the North, 347; classical revival literatures, 356, *naissance.*
Hŭm'bert II, co 397, n. 21.
Hundred Years' results for Fran
Hungarians, conv 223; found the gary, 271, 412.
Hungary, founding
Huss, John, 420.
Hussites, the, 420.

Iceland, settled fro
Iconoclastic contr
Immunity, grants
Inquisition, the, 248; in Spain, 4
Interdict, effects o
Interregnum, the, tory, 416.
Investiture, cont 209.
Iona (ī-ō'na or ē-ō of, 39.
Irene (ī-rē'nē or empress, 123.
Irnerius (ēr-nē'rĭ-u n. 4.
Iron Crown of Lo
Isaac II, Greek en
Isabella, princess riage to Ferdin 405; sets up 409; gives Col mission, 409; d

Iş'ĭ-dore, Greek philosopher, 80.
Islam. See *Mohammedanism.*
Italian city-republics, general account of, 291–302; causes of their early growth, 291–293; the Lombard League, 293–295; dissensions among, 295; despots in, 296; Venice, 297–299; Genoa, 300; Florence, 301.
Italian Renaissance. See *Renaissance.*
Italy, results of Lombard conquest, 26; recovery of, by Justinian, 75–77; Renaissance in, 333–353; invaded by Charles VIII, 399; no national government during Middle Ages, 426; the Five Great States, 429. See *Italian city-republics* and *Renaissance.*
Ivan (e-vän') the Great, tzar, 425, 426.

Jan'i-za-ries, the, 278.
Jax-ar'teş, river, 99.
Jenghiz Khan (jĕn'gĭs-khän), 272.
Jerome of Prague, 421.
Jerusalem, captured by Saracens, 97; captured by crusaders, 230–232; Latin Kingdom of, 232; captured by Saladin, 236.
Jews, expelled from Spain, 409.
Joan of Arc, 382, 383.
John, king of England, quarrel with Pope Innocent III, 259; becomes vassal of the papal see, 260; forfeits lands in France, 367; grants *Magna Charta*, 367–369.
John the Good, king of France, 379.
Joinville (zhwăń-vēl'), 405.
Joust (jŭst), the, 184.
Julian, Count, 105, n. 11.
Justinian, Era of, 73; his reign, 73–82; recovers Africa, 73; recovers Italy, 75; as a builder, 78; his code, 79; closes schools of Athens, 79; calamities of his reign, 80.
Jutes, the, 27.

Kaaba (kä'bä, or kä-ā'bä), the, 88.
Khä'lid, Saracen general, 96.
Kiersy, capitulary of, 166, 167.
Kiev (kē'ev), 138, 424.
Knighthood. See *Chivalry.*
Kö"nigs-berg', 247.
Kō'ran, the, origin of, 94; contents of, 94.
Koreish (kō-rīsh'), Arab clan, 89.
Kublai Khan (kōōb'lī-khän), 273.

Lancaster, house of, 364, n. 1. See *Roses, Wars of the.*
Langland, William, 389.
Langton, Stephen, 259, 368.
Languedoc (lŏń'ge-dŏk), province, 247.
Langue d'Oc (läńg'dŏk"), French dialect, 400, 401.
Langue d'Oil (läńg'dwĕl"), French dialect, 401.
Latin empire of Constantinople, 241.
Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, founded, 232; end of, 243.
Legnano (lăn-yä'nō), battle of, 294.
Leo the Isaurian, 104; as an Iconoclast, 157.
Leonardo da Vinci (lā-o-när'do dä vĭn'chē), 351 and n. 23.
Leopold, duke of Austria, 419.
Lew'es, battle of, 370.
Lewis I, king of the Franks, 130.

Libraries, founding of, 342.
Lin-dis-farne', monastery of, 39.
Literature, English, beginnings of, 387–389; French, beginnings of, 400–404; German, beginnings of, 422–424; Italian, beginnings of, 410.
Literatures, vernacular, beginnings of, 327; development fostered by classical revival, 356.
Llewellyn (lōō-ĕl'in) III, Welsh prince, 372.
Lŏl'lards, the, 390.
Lombard League, 293–295.
Lombards, kingdom of the, 25, 26; destroyed by Charles the Great, 121.
Lo-thair', emperor H. R. E., 130.
Louis VII, king of France, 236; IX, 243, n. 10; XI, 397, 398.
Lü'beck, 289.

Machiavelli (mäk-e-ä-vĕl'lē), Nicholas, 358 and n. 1; his *Prince*, 430, 431.
Magna Charta, 367–369.
Magyars (mŏd'yŏrz''). See *Hungarians*.
Maimonides (mī-mon'ĭ-dēz), Moses, 317, n. 10.
Mainz (Mīnts), 345.
Mantes (Mont), town, 198.
Manuscripts, search for, by humanists, 340, 341.
Marco Pō'lō, mentioned, 254; at Mongol court, 273.
Margaret of Denmark, 433.
Marienburg (mä-rē'ĕn-bōōrG), 247.
Matilda, empress, 199.
Matilda, countess of Tuscany, 210.
Max-i-mil'ian I, emperor H. R. E., 421, 422.
Mayors of the Palace, 23.
Mec'ca, 88.
Mediæval Age, relation to the Modern, 4.
Medici (med'ē-chē), Cos'i-mo de', 302, n. 8; Lorenzo de', 302, n. 8.
Medici, the, patrons of the New Learning, 342.
Medicine, science of, in Middle Ages, 312.
Medina (Me-dē'na), 90, 91.
Mendicant friars. See *Dominicans* and *Franciscans*.
Mercia, 29.
Merovingians, Franks, under the, 21–24.
Mer'ō-wig, 22.
Michael Angelo, 348, n. 16; 351 and n. 24.
Michelet (mēsh-lā'), quoted, 324.
Milan, 429, n. 39.
Military and religious orders. See *Hospitalers* and *Templars*.
Mĭn''ne-sĭng'ers, 423.
Mirandola, Pico della (me-rän'do-lä pē'kō), 343; 353, n. 26.
Moawiyah (mo-a-wē'yeh), caliph, 101, 102.
Mohammed, 89–94.
Mohammed II, sultan of the Ottomans, 279, 280, 281.
Mohammedanism, rise of, 87–94; doctrines, 94; under earlier caliphs, 95–109; its law system, 111, 114; polygamy under, 114; slavery, 114.
Monasticism, defined, 50; its origin, 51; in the East, 52; in the West, 53; the Benedictine monks, 54; monastic reform, 54; services rendered by, to civilization, 55–57; evil outgrowths

of the system, 57; effects upon, of Crusades, 249.
Mongols, general account of their conquests, 270–277; their invasion of Russia, 424.
Monks. See *Monasticism*.
Monte Cassino (mōn'tā käs-sē'nō), monastery, 54.
Montfort, Simon de, leader of the Albigensian crusade, 247; the English earl, 370, 371.
Moors, the, 406, 407.
Mor-gar'ten Pass, battle of, 419.
Moriscos, the, 406.
Moscow (mŏs'kō or mos'kow), 425.
Murad (mo͞o-räd'). See *Amurath*.
Mus'cō-vy, 425.

Näfels (nā'fels), battle of, 420, n. 23.
Naples, kingdom of, founded by Normans, 190; laid claim to, by Charles VIII, 399; vicissitudes of its history, 414, n. 30.
När'sēs, general, 77.
Neustria (nūs'trĭ-a), division of Frankish monarchy, 23.
New Learning, the, 341, 342; enters the universities, 355. See *Humanism*.
Nibelungen Lied (nē''bel-ung'en-lēt'), 422.
Ni-çæ'a, Church Council of, 34; taken by Seljuk Turks, 217; captured by crusaders, 228.
Ni-cop'o-lis, battle of, 278.
Nineveh, battle of, 84.
Norman Conquest, effects upon English language and literature, 386, 387.
Normandy, origin of name, 134; in French history, 148; dukes of, 190.
Normans, at home, 189; in Italy and Sicily, 190; in England, 191–200; as crusaders, 221. See *Northmen*.
North Africa, conquest of, by Saracens, 102–104.
Northern countries, the. See *Scandinavians* and *Calmar, Union of*.
Northmen, 133–148. See *Scandinavians*.
Northumbria, 29.
Norway. See *Calmar, Union of*.
Nŏv'gō-rŏd, 290, 425.

Occam (ŏk'am), William, 320.
Ō'din, Scandinavian deity, 46.
Odovakar (ō-dō-vä'kär), 15, 17.
Oktai (ŏk'tī), Mongol conqueror, 272.
Ō'läf, king of Norway, 143.
O'mar, caliph, 97–101.
Omeyyah (o-mī'yeh), 102, n. 9.
Ommeiades (om-mā'yadz), dynasty of the, 101, 102; overthrow of the house, 106.
Ordeals, among the Teutons, 67–70.
Or'le-anş (Fr. or-lā-oṅ'), relief of, by Joan of Arc, 383.
Orsini (or-sē'nē), family of the, 427.
Ostrogoths, kingdom of the, 16–19; destroyed by generals of Justinian, 75–77.
Oswald, king of Northumbria, 39.
Oswy, king of Northumbria, 40.
Oth-män', caliph, 101.
Othman I, Ottoman prince, 271.
Ō-trän'tō, 281.
Otto I, the Great, restores the empire, 131, 412.

Ottomans. See *Turks.*
Ox'us, river, 99.

Păl'imp-sests, 341, n. 13.
Palmer, the, 216.
Pan-no'ni-a, 20.
Papacy, origin of its temporal authority, 119, 120; claims of primacy by the Roman bishops, 151; circumstances that favored growth, 152–160; Concordat of Worms, 211; relations of, to the H. R. E., 202–204; revival of power in eleventh century, 204; under Gregory VII, 205–211; effects of Crusades upon, 249; under Alexander III, 258; under Innocent III, 259; effects the ruin of the empire, 262; under Boniface VIII, 263; removal of papal seat to Avignon, 265; the Great Schism, 266; reforming Church Councils, 266, 267; is still a spiritual theocracy, 267.
Papal States. See *Papacy.*
Paris, the name, 22.
Pa-ris'i-i, Celtic tribe, 22.
Parliament, English, creation of House of Commons, 370; Model Parliament, 371; effects upon, of Hundred Years' War, 384.
Pär'sees, the. See *Fire-Worshipers.*
Parsifal (pär'sē-făl), poem of, 423.
Patricius (pa-trish'ius). See *St. Patrick.*
Pax Romana, 220.
Peace of God, 219, 220.
Peasants' Revolt, in England, 380.
Pe-lu'si-um, 100.
Persia, conquest of, by Saracens, 98.
Pestilence, the Great. See *Black Death.*
Pestilence, in Justinian's reign, 81
Peter the Hermit, legend of, 224; heads an expedition, 227.
Peter of Lombard, Schoolman, 318.
Petrarca (pā-trär'kä), Francesco. See *Petrarch.*
Petrarch, as a humanist, 335–337; antagonist of the Schoolmen, 337; his feeling for the ruins of Rome, 337; his feeling for nature, 339, n. 11; his ascent of Mount Ventoux, 339, n. 11; his critical spirit, 357; friend of Rienzi, 428.
Philip Augustus, king of France, in Third Crusade, 236, 237; his quarrel with Pope Innocent III, 259; seizes English possessions in France, 367.
Philip IV, the Fair, king of France, 263, 264; his quarrel with Pope Boniface VIII, 263, 264; summons the commons to the National Assembly, 393; destroys the order of the Templars, 394–396.
Philip VI, king of France, 377, 397, n. 21.
Picts, the, 27, n. 4.
Pilgrimages, 215.
Pippin I, king of the Franks, 118; helps to establish temporal power of the popes, 119; II, 24; III, 24.
Pisa (pē'zä), 300, n. 7; Church Council of, 266.
Pisano (pē-zä'nō), Niccola, sculptor, 349.
Plăn-tăg'e-net, house of, 363, 364, n. 1.

Plato, quoted, 303, n. 11; in the Middle Ages, 355.
Poggio Bracciolini (pod'jō brät-cho-lē'nē), 341.
Poitiers (poi-tērz'), battle of, 24, 379.
Politian (pō-lĭsh'i-an), 343.
Poliziano (pō-lēt-sē-ä'nō), Angelo. See *Politian*.
Pope, the name, 152, n. 1.
Popes, Gregory I, 26; sends mission to England, 36; Zacharias, 118, 119; Stephen II, 119, 120; Leo III, 123, 124; Nicholas I, 152; Gregory I, the Great, 154; Gregory II, 155, 157; Alexander II, 192; Gregory VII, 205–211; Nicholas II, 205, n. 6; Clement II, 205, n. 6; Urban II, 224, 225; Innocent III, 247, 259; Alexander III, 258; Boniface VIII, 263; Urban VI, 266; Clement VII (anti-pope), 266; Gregory IX, 266; Alexander V, 267; Martin V, 267; Sylvester II, 319; Nicholas V, 342; Julius II, 342; Leo X, 342. See *Papacy*.
Portugal, kingdom of, its beginnings, 245; during the Middle Ages, 410, n. 28.
Prevost-Paradol (prā-vō pä-rä-dol'), quoted, 55.
Prince, the, by Machiavelli, 430.
Printing, invention of, 344–346; printing in China, 345, n. 15; introduced into England, 390.
Pris'ci-an, Greek philosopher, 80.
Provence (prō'vŏns''), 398.
Prussia, foundations of, laid by Teutonic Knights, 246.
Ptolemais (tol-e-mā'is), 234.
Răm'a-dăn''), Mohammedan fast, 89.
Raphael (răf'ā-el), 351.
Ravenna, in Gothic wars, 76.
Raymond IV, count of Toulouse, 228; VI, 247; VII, 248.
Reformation, era of, characterized, 2.
Re-mig'i-us, archbishop, 35.
Renaissance (re-nā'säns'': the italic e here has the obscure sound of e in novel), the, defined, 324; the revival in Italy, 333–353; humanism, 335–348; the artistic revival, 348–353; general effects, 353–359; relation to religious reform, 358. See *Humanism*.
Reuchlin (roich-lēn' or roich'lĭn), humanist, 347, 359.
Revival of Learning. See *Renaissance*.
Rheims (rēmz), 383.
Rhenish League, 418.
Richard I, king of England, 236, 237, 238, 239; III, 385.
Richard of Cornwall, 417.
Rienzi (rē-en'zē), tribune of Rome, 427, 429.
Rimini (rē'mē-nē), 120.
Robert the Magnificent, duke of Normandy, 191.
Rod'e-ric, king of the Visigoths, 19, 105.
Rois fainéants (rwä fā-nā-oń'), 23.
Rō'land, paladin, 121, 122.
Roland, Song of, 402.
Rollo, Scandinavian chief, 147.
Romance languages, 63.
Romance nations, 62.
Roman empire, mediæval idea of, 5; restored in the West by

Charles the Great, 123; renewed by Otto the Great, 131. See *Eastern empire* and *Holy Roman Empire.*
Roman law, influence of, in Middle Ages, 6; revival of, 70–72; Justinian code, 79.
Rome, relation of the fall of, to world history, 3; its bequest to civilization, 5; in Gothic wars, 75–77.
Rom'u-lus Au-gus'tu-lus, 16.
Roncesvalles (ron-se-väl'lĕs; Sp. rōn-thes-väl'yes), Pass of, 121.
Ros'a-mund, story of, 25.
Roses, Wars of the, 384–386.
Rouen (rōō-on'), 383.
Roussillon (roo'sĕl'yŏn''), 398.
Runnymede (rŭn'ĭ-mēd), 368.
Ru'rik, Scandinavian chief, 138, 424.
Russia, introduction of Christianity into, 45; receives elements of civilization from Constantinople, 86; the Mongol invasion, 272, 276, 424; rise of Muscovy, 425; freed from the Mongols, 425, 426.
Ruy Diaz. See *Cid.*

Säd, Saracen leader, 98.
Sā'ga literature of Iceland, 137.
St. Albans (al'banz), first battle of, 385.
St. An'selm, 314.
St. Antony, 52.
St. Benedict, 54.
St. Bĕr'nard, preaches crusade, 235; controversy with Abelard, 316.
St. Boniface (bŏn'e-fāss), 155. See *Winfrid.*
St. Co-lum'ba, 39.
St. Dom'ĭ-nic, 260, 261.
St. Dun'stan, 142.
St. Francis, 260, 261.
St. Gall, monastery of, 39, n. 7, 341.
St. Gallus, monk, 39, n. 7.
St. John, Knights of. See *Hospitalers.*
St. Louis, 243, n. 10.
St. Martin, monastery of, 127, 128.
St. Pa-chō'mĭ-us, 54.
St. Patrick, 38.
St. Peter, 152.
St. Sim'e-on Sty-lī'tēş, 150.
St. Sophia (sō-fē'ä), church of, 78.
St. Wil'frid, 40.
Săl'a-din, 237.
Salisbury, Gemot of, 195.
Säm-är-cänd', 273.
Saracens, name, 87; their conquests, 95–109; their contributions to civilization, 110–114. See *Arabs* and *Moors.*
Sä-vo-nä-rō'lä, Girolamo (jĕ-rō'lämō), 431, 432.
Saxons, continental, subjugated by Charles the Great, 122. See *Anglo-Saxons.*
Scandinavians, conversion of, 46; at home, 133; as pirates and colonizers, 134; causes of their migration, 135; settlements in Scotland, Ireland, and the Western Isles, 136; colonization of Iceland and Greenland, 136; discovery of America by, 136; saga literature of Iceland, 137; in Russia, 138; at Constantinople, 138; Danes in England, 139–146; Northmen in Gaul, 147; transformation of, 147; Norse factor in French history, 148. See *Calmar, Union of.*

Scholasticism. See *Schoolmen.*
Schoolmen, nature of their task, 313, 314; controversy of the Nominalists and Realists, 315, n. 9; the earlier Schoolmen, 314–316; Abelard, 315; the Schoolmen of the thirteenth century, 316–318; Albert the Great, 317; Thomas Aquinas, 317; Duns Scotus, 318; Roger Bacon, 319; last of the Schoolmen, 320; criticism of the Schoolmen, 320; their services to intellectual progress, 321.
Schwyz (shvīts), 419.
Scone (skōōn), Stone of, 374 and n. 9.
Scotland, wars with England, 373–376.
Scots, the, 27.
Scriptorium, 56.
Scutage (skū'tâj), defined, 368, n. 2.
Sempach (sem'päk), battle of, 420.
Serfdom. See *Serfs.*
Serfs, under feudal system, 170–173; abolition of serfdom in England, 38.
Seville (sĕv'ĭl), 105.
Sforza (sfort'sä), Francesco, 429, n. 39.
Shiahs (shē'äz), Moslem sect, 102, n. 10.
Sicilian Vespers, 414, n. 30.
Sicily, kingdom of. See *Naples, kingdom of.*
Siegfried (sēg'frēd), epic hero, 423.
Sigismund, emperor H. R. E., 420, n. 33.
Silkworm culture, introduced into Europe, 78.
Simon Magus, 207, n. 8.
Sĭm'o-ny, 207.
Sim-plic'i-us, Greek philosopher, 80.
Siroes, king of Persia, 84.
Slaves, number in Middle Ages, 171, n. 8.
Slavs, at opening of the Middle Ages, 12. See *Russia.*
Soissons (swäs'sôṅ"), battle of, 22.
Spain, conquest of, by Saracens, 105; during the Crusades, 246; early history, 405; union of Castile and Aragon, 405; conquest of Granada, 406; influence upon national character of the Moorish domination and wars, 407; growth of the royal power, 408; the Inquisition under Ferdinand and Isabella, 408, 409.
Spanish March, 121.
Stamford Bridge, battle of, 193.
States-General, the, 394.
Statute of Laborers, 380.
Stephen of Blois (blwä), king of England, 199.
Stirling, battle of, 375, n. 10.
Sturleson (stōōr'lā-son), Snor'rō, 137.
Sty-li'tes, Simeon, 53.
Sŭn'na, the, 95.
Sŭn'nītes, Moslem sect, 102, n. 10.
Sweden. See *Calmar, Union of.*
Swegen (svā'gen), king of Denmark, 143, 144.
Swiss Confederation, the, rise of, 418–420.
Switzerland. See *Swiss Confederation.*
Sy-ā'gri-us, 22.
Sym'ma-chus, 18.
Syria, conquest of, by Saracens, 96.

Taj Mahal (täzh ma-häl'), 274.
Tăm-er-lāne'. See *Timur*.
Tancred (tang'kred), 228.
Tartars. See *Mongols* and *Turks*.
Tell, William, legend of, 419.
Templars, order of the, origin, 234; abolition of, 394–396.
Testry (tes-trē'), battle of, 24.
Teutonic Knights, order of the, origin, 235; in Baltic region, 245, 246.
Teutons, character of, 8; capacity for improvement, 8; love of personal freedom, 9; veneration for womanhood, 10; virtue of personal loyalty, 10; migrations and settlements, 15–30; their conversion, 32–48; consequences of their conversion, 47; fusion with the Latins, 60–72; appropriation of Roman lands by, 61, codes of the, 65; personality of Teutonic laws, 66; ordeals among, 67–70.
Than'et, Isle of, 27.
Thebarmes, 83.
The-od'ō-ric, king of the Ostrogoths, legend of, 10; relation with Eastern emperor, 16; conquest of Italy, 17; his reign, 17–19.
Third Estate, the, beginnings of, in the towns, 304; delegates of, admitted to national assemblies, 304, n. 14.
Thomas Becket, 364–366.
Tiers État (tyêr-zā-tä'), 394.
Timur (tī-mōōr'), Mongol conqueror, 273, 274, 275.
Tintoretto (tin-tō-ret'tō), 351, n. 25.
Titian (tish'an), 351.
Tos'tig, earl, 193.
Tot'i-lä, king of Ostrogoths, 76.
Toulouse, counts of, 401.
Tournament (tōōr'na-ment), the, 183.
Tours (tōōr). See *Poitiers*.
Tower of London, 196.
Towns, effects upon, of Crusades, 251; suffer from barbarian invasion, 284; their revival, 284; rapid growth in tenth and eleventh centuries, 286; status of the chartered towns, 287; their industrial life, 287; they enter the feudal system, 286; their revolt, 287; towns in Germany, 289–291; in Italy, 291–302; their services to civilization, 302–305; their representatives in national assemblies, 304, n. 14; centers of new intellectual life, 329. See *Hanseatic League* and *Italian city-republics*.
Tow'ton Field, battle of, 385.
Treb'i-zond, 83.
Trent, Church Council of, 268.
Trou'ba-dours, the, 401.
Trouveurs (trōō'vĕr'), the, 402–404.
Troyes (trwä), Treaty of, 382.
Truce of God, 219–221; proclaimed by Council of Clermont, 227.
Tudor, Owen, 373.
Turanians. See *Mongols* and *Turks*.
Turks, Ottoman, beginnings of their empire, 277; their conquests, 278, 279; they capture Constantinople, 279; check to their arms, 280–282.
Turks, Seljuk, 217; power broken, 271.
Tyler, Wat, 381.

Ul'fi-las, apostle of the Goths, 33.
Universities, rise of the, 307, 309; faculties, 308, n. 1; "Nations" in, 309; students and student life, 310; studies and methods of instruction, 312. See *Scholasticism.*
Unterwalden (o͞on'ter-väl"den), 419.
Urban II, pope, 224, 225.
Uri (o͞o'rĭ), 419.

Väl'lä, Laurentius, 344, n. 14, 357.
Valois (väl'wä"), house of, 396, n. 20; history of France under the Valois sovereigns, 396–400.
Vandals, kingdom of the, 20, 21; destroyed by Belisarius, 74, 75.
Vā-ran'gĭ-ans, the, 138.
Venice, takes part in Fourth Crusade, 239, 240; sketch of history, 297–299; closing of the Great Council, 298; ceremony of wedding the Adriatic, 299; her "Arsenal," 299.
Venice, Peace of, 258.
Verden (fĕr'den), massacre of, 122, n. 4.
Vĕr-dŭn', treaty of, 130.
Veronese (vā-rō-nā'zā), 351, n. 25.
Vespucci, Amerigo (vĕs-po͞ot'chē, ä-mā-rē'go), 301.
Vī'king, meaning of name, 135.
Villain. See *Serfs.*
Villehardouin (vēl-är-do͞o-ăn'), 404, n. 27.
Vinland, in Norse sagas, 136.
Visconti (vēs-kon'tē), family of the, 429, n. 39.
Vlăd'i-mir the Great, tzar, 45.
Vogelweide (fō"gel-vī'de), Walter of the, 423.

Wager of battle. See *Ordeals.*
Wager of law, 69.
Wales, conquest of, 372, 373.
Wallace, Sir William, 375.
Walter the Penniless, 227.
Wardship, feudal right of, 170, n. 6.
Warwick (wŏr'ik), Earl of, the "king-maker," 384.
Wēre"gĭld', 66.
Wessex, 29.
Western empire (Teutonic). See *Charles the Great* and *Holy Roman Empire.*
Whitby, Council of, 40.
William I, the Conqueror, king of England, his youth, 191; prepares to invade England, 192; victory at Hastings, 193; his reign, 194–198.
William II, the Red, king of England, 199.
Windmills, introduced into Europe by Crusades, 252, n. 16.
Win'frid, apostle of Germany, 44.
Wink'el-ried, Arnold of, 420.
Wisby (wĭz'bĭ), 290.
Wit'an, the, 144, n. 7; becomes the English Parliament, 200.
Wĭt"ĕ-nä-gĕ-mōt'. See *Witan.*
Witiges, king of Ostrogoths, 76.
Wit'i-kĭnd, Saxon leader, 122.
Wō'den, German god, 46, n. 11.
Worms, Concordat of, 211; Diet of (1495), 422.
Wycliffe (wĭk'lĭf), John, 389.

Xeres (hā-rĕs'), battle of, 105.

Yath'reb, 90, n. 3.
Yezd, city, 110, n. 15.
York, house of, 364, n. 1. See *Roses, Wars of the.*

Zä'rä, 239.

To avoid fine, this book should be returned on
or before the date last stamped below

50M—9-40

Tx
940.2
M996
pt.1

Myers, Philip Van Ness
The middle ages

71042

NAME	DATE	NAME	DATE

Tx
940.2
M996